This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06912323 4

ANNEX

A HISTORY

OF THE

RISE, PROGRESS, GENIUS, AND CHARACTER

OF

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM:

TOGETHER

WITH A REVIEW OF "THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BY CHAS. HODGE, D. D. PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AT PRINCETON, N. J."

BY WILLIAM HILL, D. D.

OF WINCHESTER, VIRGINIA.

WASHINGTON CITY:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY J. GIDEON, JR.

1839.

Entered according to the Act of Congress, on the fourteenth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-nine, by Jacob Gideon, jr. in the Clerk's office of the District Court for the District of Columbia.

THE
NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
7351
Astor, Lenox and Tilden
Foundations.
1896

ERRATA.

Page 12, ninth line from the top, read "*their*" before *church polity*.
Same page, at bottom, read "*Calderwood*" for *Chillingwood*.
Page 19, near the end of the nineteenth line for "*us*" read *up*.
Page 37, line seventh, erase the word "*the*" before *peace*.
Page 42, in the note, for "*Charles II*" read *Charles I*.
Page 124, the sense is obscured by the omission of the following words between the first and second words of the first line, viz: "*years labouring in America, and thirty*"—it would then read, *if he had been twenty years labouring in America, and thirty when he came out*.
In the Appendix, and wherever the name of the Governor of New York appears, it should be "*Cornbury*" instead of *Cornbury*.
Page 175: erase the note at bottom of page.
Page 181: in the note at bottom erase the word *foregoing*.

CHAPTER I.

Reference to the present divided state of the Presbyterian Church—The loose and unguarded manner in which Professor Hodge uses the term Presbyterian—The true meaning of the terms Puritan and Presbyterian—Quotation from Dr. Miller upon the subject—Professor Hodge claims the majority of the Puritans in England, and of the Pilgrims who first settled New England, as good Presbyterians, and as agreeing with the strict Scotch system—What the Scotch system of strict Presbyterianism is—The Presbyterianism of Holland—The Presbyterianism of the French Protestants—Professor Hodge's misrepresentation of them corrected by a quotation from Neal's History; also, from Mosheim and others—The character of the English Presbyterians—The true character of the Puritans who settled New England—The kind of Church Government they introduced among them—The Cambridge Platform—Quotations from it—Professor Hodge's misunderstanding of it—The Saybrook Platform also misrepresented—Cotton Mather's account of the first Presbyterians in New England misrepresented by Professor Hodge—Dr. Miller and Professor Hodge at variance—Dr. Plumer positively contradicting Professor Hodge. - - - - - - - 1

CHAPTER II.

Doctor Dana's letter respecting Presbyterians in New England—Relative to the colonies, or settlements, formed by the Puritans out of the bounds of New England, and in those regions within which the first Congregations and Ministers of the Presbytery, at its formation, were located—Influence of the Puritans in Virginia—The first settlements on the Delaware river and bay, and the peninsula lying south—The first settlements in Maryland—Doctor Hawk's account of the same—The Union formed between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in London, in 1689 or 1690, by which Union Makemie and others were sent as Missionaries to the American Colonies—The manner in which the Reformation was introduced in Scotland, and the genius and character of the Scotch system—The rise, character, &c. of American Presbyterianism contrasted with the strict Scotch plan—The location of the first Presbyterian Ministers with their Congregations—Letters from the Letter Book: 1. To New England Ministers about New Haven—2. To Sir Edmund Harrison—3. To Presbytery of Dublin—4. To Synod of Glasgow—5. To Rev. John Boyle, to be laid before the Presbytery of Dublin—6. Letter of Mr. Andrews to Mr. Prince—Remarks upon the said letter. - 54

CHAPTER III.

Some further account of Mr. Andrews—His intercourse with Makemie—The agency they had in forming the Mother Presbytery—Mr. Andrews loses his high standing and influence toward the close of his life—The kind of Presbyterianism introduced into Scotland at the Reformation—The kind of Presbyterianism commenced in America—Wherein they differed from one another—Extracts from Irvine Spence, Esq.—Some mistakes which Mr. Spence fell into respecting Makemie corrected—Extracts from the Clerks' offices of Accomack county, Virginia, and Somerset county, Maryland—Extracts from the last will and testament of Mr. Anderson, Mr. Makemie's father-in-law—Extracts from Mr. Makemie's last will and testament—Comment upon these documents—Steps taken by Mr. Makemie to supply the desolate districts of country around him with preaching—He takes a voyage to England in the year 1704—Obtains two fellow-laborers from Ireland, Hampton and McNish, who were to be sustained for two years by Dissenting Ministers in and about London—Makemie and his Irish brethren arrive in America in the spring of 1705—Steps taken by Makemie to get them licensed to preach according to the Act of Toleration—Settles them over congregations already organized in Somerset county, on the eastern shore of Maryland—An account of the persecution and imprisonment of Makemie and Hampton in New York—The interesting pamphlet, containing a full report of these trials, providentially preserved, to be printed in the Appendix—An examination of Professor Hodge's argument to prove that all the original members of the Presbytery, except one, were from Scotland or Ireland—Professor Hodge mistakes the character of English Presbyterians—He is set right upon this subject—The character of the original members of the Presbytery, and of their congregations, and where located—A short account of the kind of Presbyterianism adopted by the Mother Presbytery at its formation, &c. - 113

PREFATORY REMARKS

AND

OBSERVATIONS.

The history of the rise, progress, and peculiar character of American Presbyterianism, has for some time been considered a great desideratum by many of the members of our denomination. There is certainly no other religious community, embracing such numbers and being so long in existence, who are exposed to the imputation of having practised such gross negligence in failing to preserve authentic documents of their proceedings, and who still remain in such entire ignorance respecting their own history, and the founders and fathers of their church. The Episcopalians of this country, after having long neglected this subject, are beginning to manifest a laudable zeal relative to the events connected with their church, and are tracing its history back to the commencement of the colony which began its settlement at Jamestown, upon James river. The Congregationalists of New England have carefully preserved an account of both their civil and ecclesiastical affairs, from the landing of their Pilgrim Fathers upon the rock of Plymouth. The Roman Catholics have kept themselves well informed of their movements and changes from the landing of Lord Baltimore with his colony in Maryland. The Quakers have treasured, and carefully imparted to their children, a knowledge of the various incidents and fluctuations and new settlements which arose from the possessions acquired by William Penn, and the political and religious institutions introduced by their distinguished founder in Pennsylvania, Jersey, and other States of the American Union. The Baptists have their historians, who are anxious to trace their

origin back to a remote antiquity. And the Methodists have informed almost all their members in regard to the rise and progress of Methodism, from the commencement of the labors of the Rev. John Wesley in England, and the landing of Ashbury, Coke, and others in America.

But to this day Presbyterians, generally, remain more entirely unacquainted with their own history than any other religious community. I was utterly astonished at my own ignorance of the subject, when called upon to investigate it for the purpose of preparing the present publication. And how may this general deficiency on the part of so large and intelligent a body of Christians be accounted for? It is attributable, no doubt, to a combination of untoward circumstances.

The Presbyterian Church assumed its ecclesiastical form in America long after the establishment here of the Puritans, Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, and Quakers. It is to be presumed that individuals of the Presbyterian denomination, from a spirit of commercial enterprise and a desire to accumulate wealth, had emigrated with others at an early date of the settlement of this country, and were scattered throughout the Colonies. But these were so few, so far removed from each other, and so destitute of any bond of union, as to prevent their associating together in organized congregations even, and much more in a presbyterial capacity, till at quite a late period. The Episcopalians were drawn to America from a South Sea dream of wealth and empire. The Puritans, Roman Catholics, and Quakers were driven into exile, to seek a hiding-place in the wilderness, by unrelenting bigotry and persecution in the land of their nativity. But, at the time the American Colonies commenced settling, Scotland, where alone the Presbyterians were in any considerable numbers, was comparatively free from persecution, and Presbyterianism was established and fortified in that nation by the laws of the land, and was approved of by the strong and popular sentiment of the kingdom. It is true that James, after he ascended the throne of England, did endeavor, by frequent and insidious attempts, to introduce a kind of half-way Episcopacy into Scotland; and his successor, Charles I, persisted in the same ill-judged attempt, until it cost him his crown and his head. But they made poor progress in their undertaking; and although the Scotch

people were subjected to many hardships and sufferings, they never ceased to contend for their rights, and never despaired of obtaining an ultimate triumph—so that few, if any, were induced to expatriate themselves on account of religion, Scotland being regarded by them as the homestead of Presbyterianism through all these troublous times. Ireland also, where there were a number of Presbyterians descended from Scotland, though it had been the scene of bloody massacre and persecution, was still contending for its rights, and in hopes of success—so that the tide of emigration which, at an after period, brought so many Irish Presbyterians to this country, had not then set in upon that people. These circumstances may account for the late period at which Presbyterianism made its appearance in the American Colonies, as well as for the absence of materials connected with its earliest history in these Provinces.

Within about thirty years after the organization of the first Presbytery, emigrants from Ireland came over in vast numbers, and among them a number of Irish and Scotch Ministers, who all united with the Mother Presbytery. But these *new comers* brought over with them sentiments respecting church government so different from what had before been in use, that a scene of strife and contention ensued, which, in 1741, effected a great schism that rent the church into nearly two equal parts. This schism kept these two rival and hostile parties asunder for seventeen years. During a part of this period the Colonies were engaged in bloody wars with the French and Indians, and these contests were closely followed by the revolutionary war, of eight years' continuance, which unhinged every thing, broke up many congregations, destroyed many valuable documents, and left such a demoralizing influence behind it as to paralyze all religious efforts for a number of years. Hence the apathy and want of interest that ensued upon the subject of religion, and hence also the barrenness of incidents and facts necessary to make up and embellish an historical collection.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, which held its first meeting after its formation in 1789, soon turned their attention to the importance of a church history; and in the year 1792 appointed Dr. Ashbel Green and Ebenezer Hazard, Esq. a committee to prepare for publication, as speedily as possible, a work on the subject—directing, at the same time, that all the old records and

other documents that could be obtained should be put into their hands, and that all the Presbyteries should assist in the matter by sending up each a condensed history of itself, to be used in forming a general history of the church. This committee had this business before them, with a large mass of minutes, documents, and papers, for a great number of years, reporting at each meeting of the Assembly that they had not finished the work assigned them. For some years the excuse was, that one volume of the manuscript minutes was missing, and that they could not proceed without it; but, after many years had expired, this lost volume was found—and yet, from year to year, the committee reported that they were not ready. In 1825, upwards of thirty years after their appointment, there was published in the Christian Advocate one number, as the beginning of our church history—and in the year 1830 a second number made its appearance; but there this matter ended, for the committee said they had not time at command to devote to this work in order to bring it to a close. It is to be lamented that this talented committee, with such ample materials in their hands, in so many years could not produce the desired work, which it is believed any man of business habits (and both were known as such) might have effected in less than one year. This distressing delay, however, may be accounted for by the supposition that the committee differed in their sentiments respecting some historical fact relative to the church, and, as neither would yield, they resigned without giving the whole of the reasons, and the true one among the rest, why they had failed to accomplish the important work confided to them. I have such information from a source which will not be disputed.

When this committee resigned, the Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, of Princeton, was appointed to prepare this history, and the documents and papers were all put into his hands. It is not now remembered whether any one else was associated with Dr. Miller to assist him in performing the work, but the impression is that there was not. After keeping the papers in his hands about two years, Dr. Miller informed the Assembly that his other duties so entirely occupied him, that he could not execute his commission, and therefore he resigned the office conferred on him. The papers were then returned to Dr. Green, in whose hands, it is presumed, they are still to be found. It is much to be regretted that, through ne-

glect, these important papers should be kept shut up so long, and that so few members of the church should have access to them, when they contain so much matter of momentous consequence, calculated to correct many of the prevalent mistakes respecting the rise and progress and true character of the church; and which, by an unfortunate fire or other accident, might involve our history in impenetrable darkness forever.

About eight years ago, the Presbytery of Winchester, of which I was then a member, appointed me and perhaps another member (for I was not then present and have never seen the minute) to collect materials and prepare a history of that Presbytery. The performance of this duty, I was told, was expected chiefly if not wholly from myself, as being the oldest member of that body, having been a member of it from its organization. In considering the matter, I concluded it would be necessary, as an introduction to the history of that Presbytery, to go back so far as to give a succinct account of the history of the Presbyterian Church in Virginia, and thus to show from what source that Presbytery derived its organization. This led me to inquire from whence the first Presbytery in Virginia sprung, and when and how Presbyterianism was introduced into that State. I did not expect to find Presbyterians within those limits prior to that extraordinary excitement which took place in Hanover county about the time Mr. Robinson visited those parts, and which led to the settlement in Virginia of that highly favored servant of God, the Rev. Samuel Davies, of whom I had heard so much from many who professed religion under his ministry, and with whom I had been so well acquainted in my youth; but, to my astonishment, I found that the first Presbyterian Minister who ever visited these Colonies was settled in Virginia, and that this State was in fact the cradle of American Presbyterianism. This was quite a new and a very interesting discovery to me. I was surprised at my former ignorance, and could meet with no brother who possessed more knowledge of the subject than myself. With a view to be still better informed, I immediately began to search for information and documents from every quarter where I thought they could be obtained. I became almost enthusiastic upon the subject; and in order to prepare the history of the little and comparatively young Presbytery of Winchester, I was led to an ac-

quaintance with the rise and progress of the Presbyterian Church from its commencement in these United States. I then determined to write the history of that church in Virginia from its commencement; but, finding that this could not be done without giving the history of its introduction into America, and wishing others to share in the interesting discoveries I had made, I set myself to work to gather materials for this laborious yet pleasant undertaking. Thus matters stood till the meeting of the Synod of Virginia at Petersburg in October, 1836. At that meeting a beloved brother mentioned, without my knowledge that he intended to do so, that I was engaged in such a work, and had made some progress in it. That beloved Synod was pleased to express great pleasure at this information—for as yet I had mentioned it to but few—and passed a resolution expressing their desire that I should prosecute the work to a conclusion with all possible despatch; and also appointed a prominent member from each Presbytery to gather what materials they could within their respective bounds, and send them to me, and to afford me all the assistance in their power. It was grateful to me to receive such an expression of confidence from brethren I so much loved and respected, although their request that I should finish as speedily as possible a work attended with so much labor imposed a heavy duty on me, without rendering me any certain assistance, for I received not the slightest aid from the respectable committee which they appointed, either verbally or in writing, except a few statistics from the stated clerk of Winchester Presbytery, where I least needed help of the kind. During the month of May, 1837, I visited Philadelphia, and with some difficulty obtained permission to examine the original minutes of the Mother Presbytery, and other documents and papers giving information respecting the early history of the church. My permission to use these papers, and take notes and extracts, was limited to about a week, at the expiration of which time I was obliged to return them. With these materials, and what I had before collected, I went to work, and prepared as much of the early history of the church in manuscript as I supposed would make one common-size octavo volume. During the autumn of the year 1837, I wrote to Dr. Miller, expressing a desire, if he could command as much time, that he would revise my manuscript before it was put to press, and favor me with his

friendly remarks on, and objections to, any thing he might meet with that he disapproved of. I stated, as the reason why this application was made to him, that I supposed he had studied the history of our church with more care than any one I knew of, and had access to the best sources of information, and that I wished the work to be as free from faults as possible before it issued from the press. He returned a very friendly and polite answer, saying that he had not as much time at command as such an undertaking would require; and, if he had, his eyes were in such a weak state as would render it highly improper for him to attempt it. But he said candor required him to tell me that he differed entirely with me in relation to some statements of facts he had seen in some of my letters lately published in the Richmond Religious Telegraph, but he did not state what those facts were. I immediately wrote back, and told him I thought it was due to candor and the friendship that had so long subsisted between us, to tell me what the points were upon which we differed, and the grounds or reasons why he differed from me. He promptly replied, and stated that we would be at issue regarding my supposition that there were some of the congregations belonging to the Mother Presbytery who were suffered to manage their affairs without ruling Elders, and that the Presbytery at first omitted adopting any confession of faith or form of government; that my statements had lately been opposed in the Presbyterian, and, as he supposed, by Dr. Green; and that, if he had seen Dr. Green's numbers in the eleventh volume of the Christian Advocate before he published his letters addressed to the members of the Presbyterian Church, his statements in several respects would have been different from what they were. I had been nearly eight years preparing materials and forming my opinions, and had taken my ground before any high excitement or division had occurred in our church, and a great part of my manuscript had been prepared before the exciting and divisive scenes that happened at the Assembly of 1837. I had not seen the strictures upon my opinions then, which had been made in the Presbyterian. I sought that paper without delay, and was much surprised that my statements were so flatly contradicted. I had overlooked the numbers in the Christian Advocate, although I took that publication. I had not then read the numbers in the eleventh volume, and the statement in the Pres-

byterian was but a repetition of what I found had been in the Christian Advocate. Finding Dr. Green and myself so pointedly at issue, I went immediately to Philadelphia, waited upon the Doctor, and told him I had discovered we differed upon some points relating to our church history; and that, as I was preparing a history for the press, I wished another opportunity to examine the records and papers in his possession, to see if I had been mistaken, as I wished to publish nothing that could not be substantiated. He said he was glad to hear me say so, and, with more cheerfulness than before, gave me the use of them, without restricting me as to time, as he did before. I kept them about ten or twelve days, perused them very carefully, and procured the assistance of an amanuensis to aid me in making extracts. This second examination of the records, with other documents which then fell in my way, confirmed me more than ever in the correctness of my first opinions and statements.

Wishing, however, before I put my work to press, to hear every thing that could be said against the grounds I meant to take, I came home and published in the Southern Religious Telegraph a few hasty Sketches, to elicit what might be said in opposition to what I thought was the truth in the case. The publication of these hasty and superficial papers excited more attention and awakened more interest than I anticipated. The anxiety with which they were sought after, plainly showed that they communicated information and made disclosures that were much needed, and by them many of our best informed Ministers were brought to see how little they knew before of the rise and progress of our beloved church, which induced them ardently to desire still further information upon that subject; and hence, desires and importunities from various and distant quarters have been sent to me ever since to prosecute this work still further. But while my Sketches afforded pleasure to many, they awakened apprehensions and enkindled opposition, in these times of party collision, to a degree which was little expected. My opinions upon American Presbyterianism having been formed before party strife had done such mischief among us, my statements were made entirely irrespective of *these evil times on which we have fallen.* The application I made to my venerable and much respected friend Dr. Miller, and the sentiments therein

expressed of my intention to conclude my history without entering into the present controversies, afford evidence of this. Although I knew we had begun to differ upon some of the points of late litigation, I wished and expected him to assist me in preparing a history of our church, without anticipating at the time that there would be any material difference in our views. But, to my grief, I found that in this I was disappointed, and that some of the opinions I had expressed had alarmed the zealous partisans in existing controversies. I saw clearly what I did not apprehend before, that it was to be made a party business, and that what I had stated as historical facts were thought to impinge heavily against one side of the controversy.

But my poor meager Sketches had the effect of producing the main result I wished, which was that, if opposition was to be made to my sentiments, I might see it in all its force in time to profit by it, before I went more at large before the community. If arguments were to be brought forward which could not be answered, I felt perfectly willing to yield to conviction. If only such arguments were used as were calculated to mislead and conceal the truth, I was willing to do what I could to defend the truth. Dr. Hodge's late work no doubt contains the substance of all that can be said in opposition to the positions I have taken; and, from what he says in his preface, it seems that this work was assigned him by a grave consultation of the strongest men who belonged to an opposing party. It is then to be looked upon as the joint production of the strength of a party, aided by men venerated for age, experience, and talents, and having access to the best sources of information and means of defence. Nothing but a full conviction of the truth of my cause could induce me, with my slender abilities and scanty means, to contend with such fearful odds against me. But truth is mighty, and must prevail. If her sacred cause should ever need my help, I trust that it shall not be withheld, whether it expose me to evil or good report. The only regret I feel upon this occasion is, that I have not talents for her defence more adequate to the importance of the occasion. The situation in which I am now placed, and the duty I now undertake to perform, are among the most painful incidents which have occurred during my wearisome pilgrimage. At my advanced time of

life, to be separated from dear friends and brethren with whom I have been accustomed to go to the house of God and take sweet counsel together, must be attended with any thing but pleasure. No motives of ambition could induce me to expose myself to what I foresee awaits me now, at the close of life, for the stand I take. "Ambition should be made of sterner stuff." The reward I am looking for, from earth, is only *the peaceful rest of the grave.* Earth holds out no other inducement to me. "There the wicked cease from trouble, there the weary are at rest."

If my young Brother, Professor Hodge, should have his feelings wounded by any of my strictures, I hope he will not view it as coming from the hands of an enemy, but from those of a friend. When in earnest upon any subject, I have my own manner of expressing myself, which I am sure is not always the happiest, *but nature with me will out.* My apology is, "not that I loved him less, but truth more."

The unexpected and unpleasant turn this business has taken has subjected me to no little trouble. The first draught I had made of my history was not at all of a controversial nature. I did not then expect serious opposition from any quarter. That which had cost me so much labor is now laid aside as not suited to the occasion. I had to begin my work anew, and to prepare to defend every inch of ground I ventured upon. This must be my apology for the very imperfect dress in which this introductory number must appear to every intelligent reader. It is a hurried and hasty production; a want of method is very apparent throughout; the importunity of friends would not allow me time to transcribe it, and I could procure assistance from no one; while the calls of duty and various avocations were constantly causing interruptions and making breaks in the work. It is chiefly made up of documents and authorities which may appear to some unmeaning and tiresome, but their necessity and importance will appear in the numbers that are to follow, and which will probably be more interesting to common readers. It was necessary, however, in order to ultimate success, to have the foundation well laid at first. I expect to have *a cleanlier road to tread* hereafter, and not to be so hurried. The present number is designed to prepare the way for a fair commencement of the history on hand. It is merely preliminary to

what is to follow. It brings us no further than to the formation of the first Presbytery. The most important and authentic part of our work is yet to follow. Professor Hodge's work, of course, has not been reviewed further than to bring us to this point. The balance of his first number, and those that may follow, will be noticed as our work progresses, and as incidents arise, in chronological order, reserving the privilege of glancing at his positions and statements as occasions may seem to require. None of his arguments will be passed over for fear of meeting them, unless he should bring forward much stronger ones than we have yet seen.

A HISTORY

OF THE

RISE, PROGRESS, GENIUS AND CHARACTER

OF

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM.

CHAPTER I.

Reference to the present divided state of the Presbyterian Church—The loose and unguarded manner in which Professor Hodge uses the term Presbyterian—The true meaning of the terms Puritan and Presbyterian—Quotation from Dr. Miller upon the subject—Professor Hodge claims the majority of the Puritans in England, and of the Pilgrims who first settled New England, as good Presbyterians, and as agreeing with the strict Scotch system—What the Scotch system of strict Presbyterianism is—The Presbyterianism of Holland—The Presbyterianism of the French Protestants—Professor Hodge's misrepresentation of them corrected by a quotation from Neal's History; also, from Mosheim and others—The character of the English Presbyterians—The true character of the Puritans who settled New England—The kind of Church Government they introduced among them—The Cambridge Platform—Quotations from it—Professor Hodge's misunderstanding of it—The Saybrook Platform also misrepresented—Cotton Mather's account of the first Presbyterians in New England misrepresented by Professor Hodge—Dr. Miller and Professor Hodge at variance—Dr. Plumer positively contradicting Professor Hodge.

The circumstances which have given rise to this discussion are of a very serious and agitating character. They are the differences of sentiment and feeling, respecting *truth* and *order*, which have agitated the Presbyterian Church for some years past, and which have split our ranks, and divided the Church into two parties; each of which has become too much excited to see, at all times, the points of difference in a calm and impartial light. It is too common, in all such cases, to take a one-sided view of a subject, and to fancy we can discern arguments in favor of our cause from sources which would never be thought of in times of more calm and dispassionate reflection. Professor Hodge has become a zealous

and an industrious partisan, in those vexed and agitating questions which have embroiled our bleeding Zion. He has written with so much talent and effect, that he is now looked up to as the champion on one side. And his party has cause to prize him highly. He seems, in the present case, to break ground at a great distance, in going back not only to the first organization of the Mother Presbytery to find the causes of our troubles, but further back still, even to the commencement of the colonial settlements, to gather arguments to support his cause. And as there are conflicting opinions respecting the venerable founders of American Presbyterianism, and the principles upon which they associated, he fancies that our colonial history will establish, beyond a doubt, the truth of the side he has espoused. It will be necessary, therefore, to follow him far back, and examine his authorities and the solidity of his historical assumptions. Although Presbyterianism was late in showing itself, and among the latest of the religious denominations which sprung into notice, Professor Hodge supposes he can discover its germinating elements in almost all of the first colonists, and the successive recruits that formed the different States and Provinces. He thinks he can discover good and genuine Presbyterians, and in great abundance too, among the Pilgrim Puritans who first peopled New England, the Hollanders of New York, the Scotch, and Irish, and Swede, and French, and German settlers, who first emigrated to this country.

If he should establish all these premises, the wonder will be, not that Presbyterians were so late in finding out each other, or aggregating at last, but that they had not assumed a rank among the other sects much sooner than they did; for, according to him, the harvest was truly abundant and ripe, and only needed to be gathered together. Why did he not tell us the reason why their energies lay so long dormant, or why they were so far behind others in coming to order? Are Presbyterians less enterprising and zealous than all other denominations?

There is no term used more vaguely, and in a more indefinite sense, than that of Presbyterian. Next to it, was the term Puritan—and these two are often so united, or blended together, that by many they are used and considered as synonymous terms, or as meaning the same thing. When opposition to Popery or Prelacy is to be described by the advocates of these systems, their opponents are generally stigmatised as Presbyterians, who contend for *their beloved Presbytery;* and generally refers to the Scotch and their adherents, because they were watchwords of party in that embittered controversy, which was carried on in Scotland, by the Scotch Reformers on the one side, and by Papists and Scotch and English Episcopalians on the other. In no country was the controversy of the

Reformation conducted with more asperity and bitterness than in Scotland; and seldom are more cruelty and barbarity to be met with, in history, than are to be found during the war which was carried on in Scotland, and which was stigmatised under the name of *Bellum Episcopale*, because instigated mainly by the Bishops of the day, and in their own defence. Hence, the names Presbyterian and Presbytery were used by their enemies, as meaning every thing that was reproachful and contemptible; and the term *Presbyterian* was applied to any one who manifested opposition to prelatical Episcopacy, or any of the dogmas or ceremonies peculiar to that system.

Another term of reproach was generally used in England, as applicable to those who opposed any of the rites and ceremonies which were left in the Established Church of England by Henry VIII, in his partial reformation. During the reign of that arbitrary monarch, whatever opposition was felt to his mongrel system of religion, it had to be smothered in silence for fear of his vindictive resentment. But, during the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth, a general desire was expressed to carry on the Reformation more in conformity with that which existed in other Protestant nations. Certain clerical vestments borrowed from Popery, and certain rites and usages which had been prostituted to superstitious purposes, were objected to by those who wished to see the Church assume more of its primitive purity; and the name of *Puritan* was fallen upon, as a sneering term of reproach, and applied to those scrupulous persons by their enemies. And, in England, the name of Puritan was applied to every one who adhered to the Calvinistic system of doctrines which characterized the creed and articles of that church at first, and who opposed her unscriptural rites and ceremonies. They were sometimes called Doctrinal Puritans, or Ceremonial Puritans, as they wished the application to be made.

Very little objection, at first, was made in England to the form of government then in use—and if these Puritans could have been gratified in other matters, the most of them would have remained very peacefully in the Established Church. But the high church party, with Queen Elizabeth as its head, began to grasp at power, and assert high prerogative rights, to such an extent that the ranks of the Puritans were rapidly filled up, and they soon became as much opposed to ecclesiastical domination and prelatical usurpation as their neighbors in Scotland. But it was not, primarily or mainly, Prelacy they were opposed to, so much as to its overgrown power and despotic assumptions. They could easily have been brought to submit to, and even approve of, a modified form of Episcopacy, such as was proposed by Archbishop Usher. But when this was denied them, they were called Puritans, or Presbyterians, as interchangeble terms.

Hence the loose and indiscriminate use which is so often made of these terms, which have bewildered and led astray so many persons, and which afford a pretext for those, who are hard run for better arguments, to resort to them, to answer a purpose. A quotation from Dr. Miller* will set this matter in a clear light: "Although the title of *Presbyterian* is, in popular language, chiefly confined to the churches in Great Britain and Ireland, and those who descended from them who hold the doctrine of *ministerial parity*, and maintain a government by *Presbyteries*, yet the term, as every well-informed reader knows, is much more *extensive in its application*. The Reformed Churches of Holland, France, Germany, and Geneva, were all as *really Presbyterian* as that of Scotland. That is, they all unanimously and decisively maintained the *parity* of Ministers, and the Scriptural warrant of Ruling Elders, and the government of larger districts of the Church by *Presbyteries* and *Synods*—in other words, by a number of Ministers and Ruling Elders, sitting *judicially*, and deciding authoritatively on the general concerns of the Church in a kingdom or province. Nay, even the Lutheran Churches in Germany, Sweden, and Denmark, at the era of the Reformation, adopted *the essential principles of the Presbyterian government*." [This last is a favorite expression of Professor Hodge, when he wishes to answer a purpose by it.] "They all maintained, and do to the present day maintain, the ordaining power of Presbyteries; and many of them have Ruling Elders in their churches. Luther himself, though only a Presbyter, ordained a number of Ministers, and declared ordination by Presbyters to be the Apostolic mode. In short, the whole Protestant world, excepting the Church of England and those who descended from her, at the period of the Reformation, either adopted Presbyterian principles in all their extent, *or recognized and incorporated the essential parts of that system in their respective constitutions*." A quotation or two shall now be given from Professor Hodge's late publication. Page 12. "With regard to church order, it is contended that our church adopted, from the beginning, and has ever continued to exercise, that form of government which had been previously adopted in Scotland, Ireland, Holland, and by the Protestants of France. *This system was every where, in all its distinctive and essential features, the same*." Again: page 26. "Of the Presbyterians there appear to be two divisions; the one strenuous for the whole system; the other willing to admit Archbishop Usher's plan, either from preference or as a compromise." Let these statements now be analyzed, and see how they will hang together, and where they will lead.

* Dr. Miller's Life of Dr. Rogers, pp. 123, 124.

Dr. Miller asserts that "the Lutheran Churches of Germany, Sweden, and Denmark, at the Reformation, all adopted the *essential principles of Presbyterian government*." What is it that makes one *really a Presbyterian?* "Decidedly to maintain the parity of Ministers, and the Scriptural warrant of Ruling Elders, and the government of larger districts of the Church by Presbyteries and Synods." So far from Dr. Miller. We shall now hear Professor Hodge. The system of Presbyterianism, which, he says, is every where the same, "requires the government of individual congregations to be vested in the Pastor and Elders, and not in the brotherhood. It requires the association of several particular churches, under one Presbytery, composed of Ministers and Elders. It provides for provincial and national Synods, composed of delegates from the lower courts *and recognized as belonging to Synods, the authority of review and control, and the right to set down rules for the government of the Church.*"

Ministerial parity, a warrant for Ruling Elders, and the government of the Church by Presbyteries and Synods, form the essence of Presbyterianism. Do Germany, Sweden, and Denmark govern their churches by Presbyteries and Synods? No! How then do they possess the essential principles of Presbyterian government? "They maintain the ordaining power of Presbyters, and many of them have Ruling Elders." Diocesan Bishops never ordain without the assistance of Presbyters. Are they, therefore, Presbyterians? And if some have Ruling Elders, while others have none, will that impart to the rest the essential properties of Presbyterianism? This is certainly very loose reasoning. Can Professor Hodge show us any Puritans who admitted that congregations ought to be governed by Pastors and Elders, without the brotherhood? Yet this is one of his essential features of Presbyterianism. Did the Cambridge Platform, in which he said all the essential elements of Presbyterianism predominated, contain this principle? Did the Saybrook Platform, which, he said, even went beyond Presbyterianism, admit any such principle? It is no wonder that this writer can find the essential elements of Presbyterianism in so many nations, and among so many people, upon such loose principles of reasoning as these.

Professor Hodge admits *that there are two kinds of Presbyterians*—one *strenuous for their whole system*, the other willing to admit Archbishop Usher's plan. Did Archbishop Usher's plan contain the whole of the Scotch system of Presbyterianism or not? If it did, then there was but one kind of Presbyterians—if it did not, then there was a class of Presbyterians who did not admit all the essentials of the Scotch system.

Which of these systems is it that our Professor contends for, as being adopted by the Mother Church, and always practised upon, from the beginning? Was it not the strict Scotch system? And was it not this

same strict system, which he says was professed by all the different colonists, from various nations, who first united in forming the Mother Presbytery? But hear him, once more. Page 31, note: "When the erroneous doctrines, the Popish ceremonies, and the exceeding tyranny of the high church party, under Charles I, had driven almost the whole of the better part of the Church, as well as the nation, into the ranks of the Puritans, there were among them *many* who were sincerely attached to Episcopacy, and who desired nothing more than the correction of the abuses of that system. With these, the Presbyterian Puritans were generally disposed to make a common cause, and to settle the Church on the plan that was called '*Primitive Episcopacy*,' according to which the Bishop was little more than the presiding officer of a Presbytery—an *episcopus præses*, not *an episcopus princeps*, having the sole power of ordination and discipline. This is perfectly consistent with their decided preference for their own plan of government." It is asked, is this consistent with the Scotch system? Did the Scotch ever sanction such a system? It was once imposed upon them. Did they ever submit to it as a compromise? Was there any thing in the Act of Union of 1801 as offensive as this? Are not the essential principles of Presbyterianism the same at one time as at another?

Let the inquiry now be made, what was the Scotch system, of which we have heard so much of late, and from which authority is pleaded for the reforming policy which has unsettled and upturned our former peaceful Church. It is now contended that it is essential to that system that the Church should be governed by Church Sessions, consisting of the Pastor and Ruling Elders—that these Ruling Elders must now be elected for life, and ordained in a certain form, or else the want of it will vitiate all that comes in contact with it. Though the Scotch Church sometimes chose Elders only from year to year, that is not the system now pleaded for. Again: There must be a Presbytery, composed of the Pastors and Delegates from the Elderships of many distinct congregations; there must be Synods, composed of three or more Presbyteries; and, to finish the system, there must be a General Assembly, composed of the delegates of the different Presbyteries, and a certain portion from the principal Towns and Boroughs, also from the Universities—the whole to be presided over by the King's Commissioner. This General Assembly to possess full powers to do whatever they may think conducive to the welfare of the Church, and to deal out such powers as the Assembly may please to the inferior courts; retaining the same to themselves, at the same time, when they may think proper to exercise them. That this General Assembly has not only the power to suppress popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, profaneness, &c. but are bound to do so; and if the civil

power will not aid them in doing this work, they have *jure divino* authority to do it notwithstanding. That no liberty or indulgence is to be given to those who may differ from them in opinion concerning doctrine, government, or practice. No intercourse or communion is to be held with other sectaries, nor will they, to this day, admit even one of their old school advocates, from this or any other country, into their pulpits, or to sit in their judicatories. The [system will not, and never did, admit of compromise with any other. It will have the whole or nothing. They are consistent, if their Divine right claims can be made out. It is not to be wondered at, then, that even the aliens or retainers of this system should exhibit something of the same uncompromising and domineering spirit; for it is *an essential element or principle of the system itself*. Witness the Solemn League and Covenant, and its history and effects in Europe and elsewhere.

This Scottish system is essentially and necessarily illiberal and intolerant; it cannot be otherwise to be consistent, and it is made still worse by its connexion with the State, as established by law. History does not afford a solitary instance of a compromise, or an act of tolerance, further than they were compelled by a power superior to their ecclesiastical courts. Such is the PATERNITY which Professor Hodge is anxious to establish for himself and his party. Gen. 49—5, 6. "Simeon and Levi are brethren. The instruments of cruelty are in their habitation, [system.] O my soul, come not thou into their secret! Unto their Assembly, mine honor, be not thou united, for in their anger they slew a man, [yea 60,000,] and in their self-will they digged down a wall," [even the bulwarks of our Constitution.]

Be it remembered, that it is only the Scottish system of church polity, according to Pardovan and Stuart, which has grown into such high favor of late, and which strenuous attempts are being made to bring into operation among us, that is now the subject of discussion and dissection. The Scotch, as a people and a nation, deserve to stand among the highest for intelligence, morality, and personal piety. No one can read the history of their wars and persecutions without the liveliest interest and highest respect; a more noble race of confessors and martyrs the world never produced; and more piety and heavenly mindedness are nowhere to be found. But while these feelings are excited by their great suffering, one cannot help wishing they had possessed more enlarged and enlightened views upon some subjects, especially religious freedom and tolerance, and that they had shewn more of the meekness of wisdom and the milk of human kindness. The greater part of their misfortunes proceeded from the contractedness of their views and system upon certain points. It was their illiberality, their exclusive and uncompromising principles, which over-

threw the fairest and brightest prospects for civil and religious liberty that Europe ever saw. It was more their misfortune than their crime that it was so. They were honest in their convictions, though mistaken, and hence their fiery and indiscreet zeal, which defeated its own objects and plans of operation. It was the spirit of the day, and we must not censure them too severely for not being wiser than all the rest of mankind, for all nations and sects partook alike, with them, in their narrow, selfish, and short-sighted policy. The Scotch, as a nation, are not readily given to change, and are noted for a pertinacious adherence to old ideas and habits to this day. But, for mercy's sake, let us not sacrifice all the rights and privileges acquired by increasing light and experience, to honor them or their system.

The Presbyterians of Holland exhibit, in some respects, the same traits of moral character as their Scotch neighbors—having adopted the same ecclesiastical polity, with some shades of difference. They differ, however, in two important features in their system. They have no large General Assembly, with unlimited powers, to meet annually. Their Synods are their highest courts of judicature; their ecclesiastical affairs are generally transacted in, and by, their Classes or Presbyteries. Whether it is owing to their not having a General Assembly, or that they, as a nation, are more phlegmatic and less excitable than the Scotch, that they are not so subject to feuds and party dissensions, each one may judge for himself, but such is the fact. Another trait of difference is, that the Church of Holland has frequently engaged in colonizing or locating churches in foreign lands, which still retained their connexion with the Mother Church at home, who continued to exercise her watch and care over her distant branches. Scotland never colonized a church out of her own limits. Individuals might emigrate to foreign lands, but they would in all such cases have to take care of themselves.

One more difference is, that Holland has manifested more tolerance and hospitality toward refugees, from other lands, on account of persecution. She has been made an asylum for the oppressed from different lands. This has been the case from different parts of Germany and Switzerland—from France, England, and other parts of the world—and although Holland has not been clear from persecuting her own subjects, yet she has generally been lenient and indulgent to foreign Christians.

This is more than can be said of Scotland; we never read of refugees, in any number, flying from persecution to Scotland for refuge, nor of her tolerating any church from abroad within her borders. The reader may try to account for this the best way he can.

But Holland, like all other nations where religious establishments exist, has felt the demoralizing influence of such an unnatural alliance, by

paralyzing individual exertion and sinking the churches into a state of lukewarmness and conformity to the world. But Hollanders are zealous Presbyterians in their own way, find them where you may—but not apt to amalgamate and unite with others; they are famous for a clanish nationality of character, to the second and third generations.

The Presbyterianism of Geneva has deteriorated sadly from its connection with civil authority; they have manifested an illiberal spirit of intolerance from the days of Servetus to the present day. This has always, more or less, been the case of every church when closely allied to the civil authority.

The Protestants of France exhibited a different character at different times. While they were favored at Court, patronised by the nobility, and their religion established by the Queen of Navarre, they were like Christians have always been in temporal prosperity and at the right hand of power. They could then persecute the poor Independents, who had fled to their maritime coasts from oppression in England. But when their Palladium, the famous edict of Nantz, was revoked in the year 1685, and they were made to feel the effects of unrelenting oppression and exterminating persecution, their characters were entirely different. Like the good Presbyterians of Scotland, their religion always appeared best when they were under trials and afflictions. A suffering time is the Christian's shining time. Night shews the brilliant stars which day obscures.

To shew the correctness of our Princeton Professor's statements respecting the French Protestants, from among whom many united in forming some of the first American Churches, and contributed in forming the character of American Presbyterianism, I shall now furnish the reader with a few extracts from Professor Hodge's work, together with his authorities; and, having done this, I shall contrast with his statements extracts from authorities of the most indisputable character.

Page 14, Professor Hodge makes these remarks: "It is difficult to know [sneeringly no doubt] what is meant when it is said [here he quotes Dr. Hill's Historical Sketches, No. 7,] the Presbyterian systems of the French Huguenots and of South Britain were much more mild than those of Holland and Scotland, where they had the civil authority to protect them and enforce their enactments." "Such remarks are frequently made." "It is said that we adopted a system more allied to the mild form of Presbyterianism prevalent among some of the Reformed Churches than to that of Scotland."—pp. 15, 16.

"*It is a mistake* [says he] to suppose that French Presbyterianism was more mild than that of Scotland, as would abundantly appear from a review of Quick's Synodicon, or the acts, decisions, decrees, and canons

of those famous National Councils of the Reformed Churches of France. There were twenty-nine of those Synods held at irregular intervals, in the course of one hundred years, as permission could be obtained from Government. The first was held in 1559, and the last in 1659. The revocation of the edict of Nantz, of course, put a stop to all such assemblies, and consummated that long train of persecution by which the Reformed Churches in France were nearly extirpated." "Few portions of the Christian Church have higher claims on the sympathy and respect of Protestants than the Reformed Churches of France. They were, however, rigidly Calvinistic and strictly Presbyterian, and those who do not respect those characters cannot respect them. Some idea of the kind of Presbyterianism which prevailed in France may be gathered from the following facts: The Provincial Synods were obliged to furnish their Deputies to the National Synod, with a commission in the following terms: 'We promise before God to submit ourselves to all that shall be concluded and determined in your Holy Assembly, and to obey and execute it to the utmost in our power; being persuaded that God will preside among you, and lead you by his Holy Spirit into all truth and equity, by the rule of his word, for the good and edification of his church, to the glory of his great name, which we humbly beg of his Divine Majesty in our daily prayers.' Quick, vol. 1, p. 478. "A Confession which had been drawn up by Calvin was read word by word, and re-examined in every particular point and article, and the Deputies swore or protested, for themselves and principals, 'to live and die in the faith.' The Confession of Faith and body of Church Discipline of the Holland or Low Countries were then read, and the Assembly [or French Synod] having humbly and heartily blessed God for that sweet union and agreement, both in doctrine and discipline, between the Churches of this Kingdom and of that Republic—when the members of the French Synod and the Deputies from Holland did mutually subscribe each other's Confessions," &c. This was particular and minute enough, one might suppose. But again, page 17: "When the Canons of the Synod of Dort were presented to the National Synod of France, held in 1620, they were all received and approved, by the common unanimous consent, as agreeing with the Word of God and the Confession of Faith of these our Churches."

Page 18: "In the Synod in 1644–5, it was reported by certain Deputies from the maritime Provinces that there do arrive to them, from other countries, some persons going by the name of *Independents*; and so called for that they teach every particular church should of right be governed by its own laws, without any dependency or subordination unto any person whatever in ecclesiastical matters, and without being obliged to own and acknowledge the authorities of Colloquies or Synods in matters of discipline or or-

der, and that they settle their dwellings in this Kingdom—a thing of great and dangerous consequence, if not in time carefully prevented. Now this Assembly, fearing lest *the contagion of this poison* should diffuse itself insensibly, *and bring in a world of disorders* and confusions upon us, [Oh! the horrors of Congregationalism!] all the Provinces are therefore *enjoined*, but more especially those bordering on the sea, to be exceedingly careful that this evil do not get footing in the Churches of this Kingdom," &c. &c. Quick, page 467.

All this sounds very much like doctrines that have been taught not one hundred years ago, and was no doubt thought a precious and conclusive document in defence of them. But let us hear the Princeton Professor now, *in propria persona*, p. 19: "There are many acts of these Synods which would make modern ears tingle, and which prove that American Presbyterianism, in its strictest form, was *a sucking dove*, compared to that of the immediate descendants of the Reformers." [Alas! for these degenerate times!] "*To maintain truth and order* in the Church in these days, *it required* a sterner purpose and firmer conviction than are commonly to be met with at the present time, when many are wont to change their church and creed almost as readily as they change their clothes. This account of the French Church has been given because, as will appear in the sequel, *there was at an early period a strong infusion* of French Presbyterianism in the churches of this country, and it is well to know something of its character." Gentle reader, be cool. You certainly have come to the conclusion that I have been slandering or caricaturing the Princeton Professor, in giving this as a fair extract of what he has dealt out for our edification. Then read for yourself, and brand me with infamy if I have done him the least injustice. This quotation, which is made with such an apparent air of triumph and approbation by the respected Professor of Princeton, should startle every American Presbyterian. I evidently saw the tendencies of certain doctrines which have been lately introduced into our church, and which have already done so much mischief, but I did expect these dangerous sentiments would recoil upon themselves, and defeat their legitimate consequences, before they would be much longer endured; but this last quotation has to me an awful squinting. Professor Hodge certainly was not aware how he committed himself by quoting, in this unguarded way, such authorities to establish the pedigree and blood of American Presbyterianism, without a hint of disapproval or disclaimer, but rather in triumphant exultation that he had established his position beyond the possibility of refutation. He certainly has not done himself justice, but has shown himself to be farther gone than he really is, or intended to be, in his defence of strict Scotch and French Presbyterianism.

The object our Professor had in view was to show that strict and pure

Presbyterianism is the same, in substance, whether we find it in Scotland, France, Holland, Geneva, or South Britain; that the American Church was based upon the same principles as the Scotch, French, Holland, &c. Churches were, and that these are the principles for which he and his party are contending, and determined to preserve and maintain.

After describing the doctrine and church polity of the French Protestants, he says there were many of them high-handed acts of authority, such as banishing the Independents who were flying from persecution, calling church polity poison, and charging all its ministers to keep a good look out lest any of this way should get a footing among them; he also says there were other acts of their Synods which would make modern ears tingle, but which were required in those times, and were executed by those immediate descendants of the Reformers, compared with which American Presbyterianism, in its strictest forms and most rigid days, was but a sucking dove. He contends that, at an early period, a strong *infusion* of this French Presbyterianism was introduced into our American Church, and that he made those statements to let it be known what was the true character of American Presbyterianism. If this be the kind of Presbyterianism for which Professor Hodge pleads, and which he is inculcating upon our theological students, we have arrived at an awful crisis indeed.

But I am pleased to think that I can now prove that Professor Hodge has been entirely mistaken in the kind of French Protestants, which he supposed those were who fled to this country, formed a connection with our earliest churches, and assisted in giving a character to American Presbyterianism. I shall be able also to prove that French Presbyterians differed in many respects from Scotch Presbyterians.

See Neal's His. Pur. vol. 2, p. 28. King James VI, before he left Scotland to take possession of the crown of England, declared in the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, with bonnet off and hands lifted to heaven, "that he praised God that he was born in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place as to be king of such a church, the sincerest [i. e. the purest] kirk in the world. The Church of Geneva (says he) keeps Pasche and Yule, (Easter and Christmas.) What have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbor Kirk of England, their service is an evil-said mass in English. They want nothing of the mass but the liftings. I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same, and I forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall maintain the same."* Why did that stupid hypocrite James use such language in the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland? He

* Collingwood's History of the Church of Scotland, p. 256.

spoke as he had been taught, and as he knew would please that Assembly. The Scotch Kirk held other Reformed Churches in contempt because they still observed Pasche and Yule, (as Geneva and France did,) with other remnants of Popery. The Church of French Protestants was but a young dove to the Kirk of Scotland.

At the time the French Synod, in the year 1644, passed those acts which Professor Hodge cites with such apparent pleasure, the Protestants of France were in great favor with the reigning king, Francis I, who, out of opposition to Charles V, did many very absurd and inconsistent things respecting the subjects of the Reformation. He would patronize or persecute them, just as he could make it subserve his purposes of State. He permitted his sister, the Queen of Navarre, to establish the Reformation in the kingdom of Navarre, and it was during these days of prosperity, and at the time when gross darkness rested upon Christians of every nation respecting liberty of conscience and religious freedom, that these good French Protestants did those wicked and cruel things that Professor Hodge refers to, and which I did expect he would notice with, at least, some apology, or mark of disapprobation; but no! the poor Independents were to be proscribed and banished forthwith, for fear *they would diffuse the contagion of their poison and introduce a world of disorders and confusion in their provinces;* and, instead of censuring them for this, he tells us (with great apparent pleasure) *that there was a strong infusion of French Presbyterianism introduced into the churches in this country.* And this is the old-fashioned strict Presbyterianism he is contending for. But these same French Protestants, after the revocation of the edict of Nantz, manifested a very different spirit and character when they were flying for refuge and seeking shelter wherever they could find them. Such were the innocent young doves that flew to the wilds of America for refuge, and such was their character wherever we hear of them in those days. Let us now hear what Dr. Mosheim says of them, vol. 4th, p. 360: "The French refugees also, who had long been accustomed to a *moderate way of thinking in religious matters,* and whose national turn led them to a certain freedom of inquiry, being dispersed abroad in all parts of the Protestant world, rendered themselves so agreeable, by their wit and eloquence, that their example excited a new kind of emulation in favor of religious liberty. All these circumstances, accompanied with others whose influence was less palpable though equally real, instilled by degrees such a spirit of lenity and forbearance into the minds of posterity, that at this day all Christians, if we except Roman Catholics, Socinians, Quakers, and Anabaptists, may claim a place among the members of the Reformed Churches. It is true, great reluctance was discovered by many against this *comprehensive scheme* of church

communion; and even in the times in which we live, the *ancient and less charitable* manner of proceeding hath several patrons, who would be glad to see the doctrines and institutions of Calvin universally adopted and *rigorously observed.* The number, however, of these *rigid doctors* is not very great, nor is their influence considerable. And it may be affirmed with truth, that, both in point of number and authority, they are much inferior to the friends of moderation, who reduce within a *narrow compass the fundamental doctrines of Christianity*, on the belief of which salvation depends—exercise forbearance and fraternal charity towards those who explain certain doctrines, in a manner peculiar to themselves, and desire to see the enclosure (if I may use the expression) of the Reformed Churches rendered as large and comprehensive as possible." See Mosheim again, vol. 5, pp. 370, 371: "The Reformed Churches in France seemed at first disposed to give a favorable reception to the doctrines of this famous Synod, (the Synod of Dort;) but as these decisions were highly displeasing to the votaries of Rome, among whom they lived, and kindled anew their rage against the Protestants, the latter thought it their duty to be circumspect in this matter; and, in process of time, their real sentiments and the doctrines they taught began to differ extremely from those of the Gomarists."

"While the Reformed Churches in France yet subsisted, [i. e. before the revocation of the edict of Nantz, which took place in the year 1685,] its doctors departed in several points from the common rule of faith that was received in the other churches of their communion." "Hence we find, in the books that were composed by the doctors of Saumur and Sedan, after the Synod of Dort, many things which seem conformable not only to the sentiments of the Lutherans, concerning *grace, predestination*, the *person of Christ*, and the *efficacy of the sacraments*, but also to entertain peculiar opinions of the Romish church."* p. 372. "These less important concessions were followed by others of a much more weighty and momentous kind, of which some were so erroneous that they were highly disliked and rejected, even by those of the French Protestants themselves who were the most remarkable for their moderation, charity, and peace." pp. 373, 377. "The doctors of Saumur revived a controversy that had for some time been suspended, by their attempts to reconcile the doctrine of predestination, as it had been taught at Geneva and confirmed at Dort, with the sentiments of those who represent the Deity as offering the displays of his goodness and mercy to all mankind.

* The judicious reader will find that Dr. McLaine, the translator of Mosheim, denies that he had the slightest authority for saying that the French Protestants made the slightest advance or concession to the Church of Rome. I use the London edition of Mosheim, printed for T. Cadell, 1790.

The first person who made this fruitless attempt was John Cameron, whose sentiments were supported and further illustrated by Moses Amyraut, a man of uncommon sagacity and erudition. The latter applied himself, from the year 1634, with unparalleled zeal to this arduous work, and displayed in it extraordinary exertions of capacity and genius; and so ardently was he bent on bringing it into execution, that he made, for this purpose, no small change in the doctrine commonly received among the Reformed in France. The form of doctrine he had struck out, in order to accomplish this important reconciliation, may be briefly summed up in the following propositions: 'That God *desires* the happiness of all men, and that no mortal is excluded, *by any Divine decree*, from the benefits that are procured by the death, sufferings, and Gospel of Christ. That, however, none can be made partakers of the blessings of the Gospel and of eternal salvation, unless they believe in Jesus Christ. That such, indeed, is the immense and universal goodness of the Supreme Being that he *refuses to none the power of believing*; though he does not grant unto *all* his assistance and succor, that they may wisely improve *this power* to the attainment of everlasting salvation; and that, in consequence of this, multitudes perish through their own fault, and not from any want of goodness in God.'* Those who embraced this doctrine were called Universalists, because they represented God as willing to shew mercy to *all mankind*; and *Hypothetical Universalists*, because the *condition of faith in Christ* was necessary to render them objects of his mercy.

* The writer of this review cannot let the opportunity pass without giving here the very appropriate and judicious remarks of Dr. McLaine, the translator. "The mitigated view of the doctrine of predestination has only one defect; but it is a capital one. It represents God as *desiring* a thing (i. e. salvation and happiness) *for all*, which in order to its attainment requires *a degree of his assistance* and succor which he *refuses* to *many*. This rendered grace and redemption *universal* only in words, but *partial* in *reality*; and therefore did not at all mend the matter. The *Supralapsarians* were consistent with themselves, but their doctrine was *harsh* and *terrible*, and was founded on the most unworthy notions of the Supreme Being; and, on the other hand, the system of Amyraut was full of inconsistencies; nay, even the *Sublapsarian* doctrine has its difficulties, and rather *palliates* than *removes* the horrors of *Supralapsarianism*. What then is to be done? From what quarter shall the candid and well disposed Christian receive the solid satisfaction and wise direction which neither of these systems is adapted to administer? These he will receive by turning his dazzled and feeble eye from the *secret decrees of God*, which are neither designed to be *rules* of action nor *sources* of comfort to mortals here below, and by fixing his view upon the mercy of God, as it is manifested through Christ—the pure laws and sublime promises of his Gospel, and the reputable equity of his present government and his future tribunal."

It is the opinion of many that this doctrine differs but little from that which was established by the Synod of Dort; but such do not seem to have attentively considered either the principles from whence it is derived, or the consequence to which it leads. The more I examine this reconciling system, the more I am persuaded that it is no more than *Arminianism* or *Pelagianism* artfully dressed up and ingeniously covered with a half-transparent veil of specious, but ambiguous expressions; and this judgment is confirmed by the language that is used, in treating the subject, by the modern followers of Amyraut, who express their sentiments with more courage, plainness, and perspicuity, than the spirit of the times permitted their master to do. A cry was raised, in several of the French Synods, against the doctrine of Amyraut; but after it had been carefully examined by *them*, and defended by *him*, at their public meetings, with his usual eloquence and erudition, he was honorably acquitted.*

"The opposition he met with from Holland was still more formidable, as it came from the learned and celebrated pens of *Rivet*, *Spanheim*, *Des Marets*, and other adversaries of note. He, nevertheless, answered them with great spirit and vigor: and his cause was powerfully supported afterwards by *Daille*, *Blondel*, *Mistrezat*, *and Claude*.

"This controversy was carried on for a long time with great animosity and little fruit to those who opposed the opinions of the French Innovator. For the sentiments of Amyraut *were not only received in the Universities of the Huguenots in France, and adopted by divines of the highest note in that nation*, but also spread themselves as far as Geneva, *and were afterwards* disseminated by the French Protestants through all the Reformed Churches of Europe; and they are now so generally received that few have the courage to oppose or deny them."

"The desire of mitigating certain doctrines of the Reformed Church that drew upon it the heaviest censures from both Roman Catholics and some Protestant communions, was the true origin of the opinion propagated in the year 1641 by De la Place, concerning the imputation of original sin. This divine, who was the intimate friend of Amyraut, and his colleague at Saumur, rejected the opinion generally received in the schools of the reformed, '*that the personal and actual transgression of the first man is imputed to his posterity.*' He maintained, on the contrary, that God imputes to every man '*his own natural corruption, his personal guilt, and his propensity to sin;*' or, to speak in the theological style, he affirmed '*that original sin is indirectly and not directly imputed to mankind.*' This opinion was

* See Aymon. tome II, pp. 571, 504. Blondel, 4th vol. pp. 19, 82. Also Bayle's Dictionary, articles Amyraut, Blondel, Daille, &c.

condemned as erroneous, in the year 1642, by the Synod of Charenton; and many Dutch and Helvetic Doctors of great name set themselves to refute it,* while the love of peace and union prevented its author from defending it in a public and open manner. But neither the sentence of the Synod nor the silence of De la Place could hinder this sentiment from making a deep impression on the minds of many, who looked upon it as conformable to the plainest dictates of justice and equity; *nor could they prevent its being transmitted with the French exiles into other countries.*"

"Though these great men gave offence to many, by the freedom and novelty of their sentiments, yet they had the approbation and esteem of the greatest part of the Reformed Churches; and the equity of succeeding generations removed the aspersion that envy had thrown upon them during their lives, and made ample amends for the injuries they had received from several of their cotemporaries." Page 376.

These copious extracts might easily be enlarged, but, if these will not be thought conclusive, it would be useless to add any more. A few short comments shall now be given from them, as they stand connected with the statement given by Professor Hodge.

1. It may now be seen what were the sentiments of the French refugees who fled to this country for an asylum after the revocation of the edict of Nantz. The very same peculiarities of doctrine and order, which have been so denounced of late *as heresies of so deadly a nature* by those who have undertaken to reform the Presbyterian Church, were introduced among the French Protestants, advocated by their greatest divines, generally adopted by the Huguenots, and carried by those pious and persecuted people wherever they were scattered among the nations of the earth; and if they contributed in any manner in forming the character of the American churches, we may see what kind of Presbyterianism it was which they infused into them.

2. How small a resemblance there was between the French Protestants, after they had been schooled in adversity, and even before their dispersion, and the strict and rigid Kirk of Scotland, from the commencement of their reformation down to the present day.

3. How little dependence is to be placed on the statements of zealous partisans, under a state of high excitement and commitment, when contending for victory, unless supported by the strongest corroborating evidence. A detached quotation from an author, without referring to time, place, and circumstances, may convey an idea as foreign from the truth as if words were used with the wilful intention of deceiving.

* Aymon. Synodes des Eglises Reformées de France, tom. 2d, p. 680.

4. When Professor Hodge served his readers with his partial extracts and unguarded statements, respecting the French Protestants and their influence in giving tone to American Presbyterianism, he either knew of the contradictory statements given by Dr. Mosheim and others respecting these same refugee Huguenots, or he did not. If he did, and knowingly suppressed those documents which were so essential to give a correct view of the case he was describing, to use no harder term, I may use the language he applied to another, "this is one of the many cases in which the Doctor's zeal has proved too strong for his discretion."* But if he was unacquainted with those opposing authorities, it should teach him to be a little more cautious how he reads lectures to others, ex cathedra, upon ecclesiastical history and church polity.

5. Before he undertakes again to fight the battles of his party, he must look well before he deals such blows upon others, the report of which will make one's ears to tingle, or taunts them for changing their opinions as easily as we change one suit for another, he should see that his own coat of mail fits him, and is bound on him with clasps not easily opened.

We shall next inquire what success Professor Hodge has met with in hunting up Presbyterians from England, and among the Puritans who first emigrated and settled in New England. We shall have to be somewhat particular here, and go into detail, as this is an important part of his argument.

The colony or settlement formed in this new world, or western wilderness, by the Puritans, or Pilgrim Fathers of New England, took place in the year 1620. This settlement, or colony, was perfectly dissimilar to any other which had yet been made in the wilds of America, both as to the motives from which it was undertaken, and the results which grew out of it. Neither fame, conquest, nor wealth operated in the slightest degree in bringing those adventurers to these inhospitable shores. They were impelled by motives altogether of another character. Oppressed and persecuted at home—every degrading disability heaped upon them—ground down by fines and imprisonments to the lowest state of poverty—and still pursued with such unrelenting rigor, they were glad to find a place to hide from unfeeling enemies wherever it could be found. Their feelings were well described by the Psalmist, when he said, "Oh! that I had wings like a dove, for then would I flee away and be at rest. Lo, then would I wander far off, and remain in the wilderness; I would hasten my escape from the windy storm and tempest." Ps. 55, vs. 6, 7, 8, They were

* See Professor Hodge's late work, p. 190.

allured by no rich mines, exuberant soil, or lucrative traffic; but, embarking themselves with their little all in a few crazy vessels, they took their lives in their hands, and committed themselves to the guidance of Him who holds the wind in his fist, in search of a country, not knowing whither they were going. Cast at last, in an inclement season of the year, upon a steril coast, without accommodations or resources other than their own labor and exertions might procure, they were compelled to undergo privations and hardships almost unexampled for the sake of a peaceful conscience and the privilege of serving God as his word required.

But what kind of men were these Puritan Pilgrims, and why were they so persecuted at home? What offence had they committed? They were the most pious part of the British community—the most exemplary in their morals and strictly consistent in Christian deportment; men much given to reading the Bible and prayer, conscientiously scrupulous respecting committing sin or omitting duty, and quite peaceful and inoffensive in their deportment. Why, then, were they so oppressed and persecuted? Merely because they could not conscientiously conform to certain rites and ceremonies enjoined in the service of the Episcopal Church of England. They had not withdrawn from the service of the church, nor set us any separate or schismatical connexion. For, except Mr. Robinson and his adherents, who had declared for Independence and retired for safety to Holland, and a few others, they remained in the established church until they were expelled and given over unto the civil authority to be punished. Most of the clergymen who removed to New England were ordained and regularly inducted into parishes according to the usage of the Church of England, and continued faithfully and diligently to discharge their pastoral duties, much to the satisfaction of their parishioners and the increase of the church, both as to numbers and piety, until they were cited before the Star Chamber, or High Commission Court, for omitting some trivial ceremony, or refusing to read the book of sports on the Sabbath day, and for such crimes fined and imprisoned, or driven into banishment. They conscientiously believed that prelatical lordly Episcopacy was contrary to Scripture and the practice of the primitive church, but could have been brought to remain in this connexion, if they could have been indulged in having a few unscriptural ceremonies repealed, and been suffered themselves to have dispensed with their use. A small reduction, in form, of Prelacy would have satisfied the consciences of most of them. This was the head and front of their offending. They, in common with members of the established church in that day, were honest Calvinists, according to the plain and obvious meaning of the articles of said church. They had drawn up and agreed upon no form of church polity or government con-

trary to the Episcopal form, for they were still in that connexion; and there was, unquestionably, a diversity of sentiment among their best informed Ministers upon the subject of ecclesiastical polity. For these causes, and in this manner, were they driven into exile, and to these measures is America indebted for the best colonists and settlers it has ever received. It is not pretended that they were perfect, or free from human frailties or weaknesses.

We have often heard the blue laws of New England, the sentiments of the Puritans upon witchcraft, and their intolerance towards Quakers and others, made the subject of ridicule by impious witlings or narrow-minded bigots from other denominations. That these men often gave evidence that they were deficient in judgment, in some things, must be readily admitted. But who that lived in that day is entitled to cast the first stone at them? Compare these laws and proceedings with the laws of Virginia of the same day, or those of England, Scotland, or Geneva, and they will be all found very much alike. Much more knowledge upon these subjects, especially those of witchcraft and religious freedom, has since that day been acquired, and it is probable that posterity may, at some future day, make themselves as merry at our expense.

A question will here very naturally arise: What were the sentiments entertained by the Puritans, and what kind of church government did they establish for themselves after their settlement in New England? Answer: It does not appear that they had formed or adopted any particular form of government, or were agreed among themselves in any one system, before they emigrated to this country. They had not associated together among themselves in England; not many of them were acquainted with each other before they met on the American shore. They did not come over in large companies—seldom more than two or three Ministers coming at the same time, and with considerable intervals between their arrival. They had had no opportunity of consultation as yet upon the subjects, but were led to adopt such a plan of government for themselves as each Minister, and the colonists in his immediate vicinage, might judge best adapted to answer present purposes. The infant and unformed state of society, at first, would hardly have admitted of their carrying any complete and general system into operation. Hence, each settlement, at first, without any opportunity of general conference and consultation, adopted such regulations for themselves as were thought most practicable and calculated to answer the best purpose.

In general, they had felt the effects of prelatical lordly Bishops so severely, in England, that they were universally opposed to Prelacy, and in favor of a parity among the clergy. Many of them, perhaps the majo-

rity, were in favor of Ruling as well as Teaching Elders, and all of them in favor of Deacons. For what length of time these Ruling Elders were to serve, how chosen and inducted into office, and what was the extent of their powers at the first formation of churches, I have never yet been able satisfactorily to learn. The probability is, as it appears to me, that there was a diversity of opinion and practice upon this subject. The general practice seems to have been, for the Deacons to take care of the secular interests of the church and provide for the poor, under the direction of the Pastor, and for the Elders, with the Minister or Ministers of a church, to take the spiritual oversight and government of the church in all ordinary cases, but, in all extraordinary cases, of peculiar delicacy or difficulty, to convene the Brotherhood and advise with them what was best to be done. As they had no higher judicatory to make regulations for them, each organized church, by the help of their own officers, made regulations for themselves. Such was the state of ecclesiastical affairs with them at first.

But, after some years, when their churches became more numerous and reduced to some order, and the number of Ministers from the mother country had multiplied, they began to confer and counsel with each other, and especially with such as stood prominent among them for experience, learning, judgment, and piety. In the year 1637, that is seventeen years after the commencement of their settlement and the establishment of their civil and ecclesiastical polity, the first Synod was called, to be composed of all the Ministers and Messengers from the different churches. The occasion which caused the convening of this Synod was the disturbances and errors introduced by Mrs. Ann Hutchinson, and her disciples. The Governor of the colony called this Synod together, sat among them, and took an active part in discussions. The chief business performed by this Synod was to testify against errors and disorders, and leave the rest with the civil authority, to act as was judged expedient; so that, it seems, the Governor used them chiefly as an advisory council, and immediately proceeded to inflict censures and penalties upon the offenders.

In the year 1646, another Synod was convened, but for other and more general purposes. Their systems of church polity, hitherto, had been so various and inefficient that all began to see and feel the necessity of "*settling a uniform system of discipline*" for the churches. This Synod continued their meetings, by adjournment, for three years, till 1649, when they produced the famous Cambridge Platform—which, after being adopted by the General Court, and undergoing various amendments and explanations, from time to time, has been the standard authority and form of government ever since.

In the year 1708, the Legislature of Connecticut convened a Synod at

Saybrook, who adopted the Cambridge Platform as it passed a Synod at Boston in the year 1680, and the articles of agreement entered into by the united Ministers, formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational, which was entered into at London about the year 1689, and which was similar to the one some time before in use in Massachusetts. The Platform entered into by this Synod was called the Saybrook Platform. This is of the same authority in Connecticut that the Cambridge Platform is in Massachusetts.

It will be necessary to be somewhat minute and particular in ascertaining the nature of these Platforms and Forms of Government, which served as the basis of the churches, that we may know what kind of men the Puritan settlers in New England were. As there is a diversity of opinion upon this subject, and as it has a particular connexion with the rise and character of the Presbyterian Church which, at a future day, sprung up in America, a few authentic statements and extracts will be given.

As to doctrine, the churches of the first settlers in New England were entirely orthodox, judging the meaning of that term from the confessions of the Reformed Churches on the continent of Europe, the articles of the Church of England, under which they had been raised, and even the Westminster Confession of Faith, which had been shortly before published to the world.

A Synod assembled at Cambridge, Massachusetts, September, 1648, passed unanimously the following vote, viz: "This Synod having perused and considered (with much gladness of heart and thankfulness to God) the confession of faith published by the late Reverend Assembly in England, do judge it to be very holy, orthodox, and judicious, in all matters of faith, and do therefore freely and fully consent thereunto for the substance thereof. Only in those things, which have respect unto church government and discipline, we refer ourselves to the Platform of Church Discipline agreed upon by the present Assembly. And we do, therefore, think it meet that this confession of faith should be commended to the churches of Christ among us, and to the honored court, as worthy of their due consideration and acceptance." Besides this commendatory testimonial of the Westminster Confession, as to doctrinal points, this Synod drew up a doctrinal confession in their own words, in entire accordance with the system of doctrines taught in the Westminster Confession. As there is no dispute upon this subject, the Cambridge Platform of Doctrine will be passed by.

I shall now go a little more into detail respecting their views on government and discipline. In their Platform of Church Discipline, chapter 5th, *on Church Powers, or to whom Church Power belongs*, it is said:

Sec. 2d. "Ordinary church power is either power of office, that is, such as is proper to the Eldership, or power of privilege, such as belongs to the Brotherhood. The latter is in the brethren formally, and immediately from Christ, that is, so as it may be acted or exercised immediately by themselves. The former is not in them formally or immediately, and therefore cannot be acted or exercised immediately by them, but is said to be in them, in that *they* design the persons unto office who only are to act or exercise this power."

"Chap. 6th. *On the Officers of the Church*, Sec. 3d, it is said: Of Elders, (who are also in Scripture called Bishops,) some attend chiefly to the ministry of the Word, as the Pastors and Teachers; others attend especially unto rule, who are therefore called Ruling Elders."

"Chap. 7th. *Of Ruling Elders and Deacons*. Sec. 1st and 2nd: The Ruling Elder's office is distinct from the office of Pastor or Teacher. The Ruling Elders are not so called to exclude the Pastors and Teachers from ruling, because ruling and governing is common to these with the others, whereas attending to teach and preach the Word is peculiar unto the former. The Ruling Elder's work is to join with the Pastor and Teacher in these acts of spiritual rule, which are distinct from the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, committed to them: of which sort be these that follow: 1. To open and shut the doors of the house of God by the admission of members approved by the church; by ordination of officers chosen by the church; and by excommunication of notorious and obstinate offenders renounced by the church, and by restoring of penitents forgiven by the church. 2. To call the church together when there is occasion, and seasonably dismiss them again. 3. To prepare matters in private that in public may be carried to an end with less trouble and more speedy dispatch. 4. To moderate the carriage of all matters in the church assembled—as, to propose matters to the church; to order the season of speech and silence; and to pronounce sentence according to the mind of Christ with the consent of the church. 5. To be guides and leaders to the church in all matters whatsoever pertaining to church administrations and actions. 6. To see that none in the church live inordinately, out of rank and place, without a calling, or idly in their calling. 7. To prevent and heal such offences in life or in doctrine as might corrupt the church. 8. To feed the flock of God with a word of admonition. 9. And, as they shall be sent for, to visit and pray over their sick brethren. 10. And at other times as opportunity shall serve thereunto."

"Sec. 3d and 4th. The office and work of a Deacon, therefore, being limited to the temporal good things of the church, it extends not to the attendance upon and administration of the spiritual things thereof, as the Word, Sacraments, and the like."

"Chap. 8th. Sec. 6, 7, 8. A church, being free, cannot become subject to any but by a free election; yet, when such a people do choose any to be over them in the Lord, then do they become subject, and most willingly submit to their ministry in the Lord, whom they have so chosen. And if the church have power to choose their officers and ministers, then, in case of manifest unworthiness and delinquency, they have power also to depose them—for to open and shut, to choose and to refuse, to constitute in office and remove from office, are acts belonging to the same power. We judge it much conducing to the well-being and communion of the churches that, where it may conveniently be done, neighbor churches be advised withal, and their help be made use of in trial of church officers, in order to their choice."

"Chap. 9th. *On Ordination or Imposition of Hands.* 1. Church officers are not only to be chosen by the church, but also to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer, with which, at the ordination of Elders, fasting is also to be joined. 2. The ordination we account nothing else but the solemn putting a man into his place and office in the church, whereunto he had a right before by election. Ordination is not therefore to go before, but to follow election. The essence and substance of the outward calling of an ordinary officer in the church do not consist in his ordination, but in his voluntary and free election by the church, and his accepting of that election, whereupon is founded that relation betwixt pastor and flock—between such a minister and such people. Ordination does not constitute an officer, nor give him the essentials of his office. 3. In such churches where there are Elders, imposition of hands in ordination is to be performed by those Elders. 4. In such churches where there are no Elders, imposition of hands may be performed by some of the brethren, orderly chosen by the church thereunto—for, if the people may elect officers, which is the greater, and wherein the substance of the office doth consist, they may much more (occasion and need so requiring) impose hands in ordination, which is less, and but the accomplishment of the other. 5. Nevertheless, in such churches where there are no Elders, and the church so desire, we see not why imposition of hands may not be performed by the Elders of other churches. 6. Church officers are officers of one church, even that particular one over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers—insomuch as Elders are commanded to feed not all flocks, but the flock which is committed to their faith and trust, and which dependeth on them. Nor can constant residence [by this is evidently meant confining his labors] at one congregation be necessary for a Minister—no, nor yet lawful, if he be not a Minister to one congregation only, but to the church universal; because he may not attend one part only of the church to which he is a Minister, but he is

called to attend unto all the flocks. 7. He that is clearly released from his office in relation unto that church whereof he was a minister, cannot be looked at as an officer to perform any act of office in any other church, unless he be again orderly called unto office, which, when it shall be, we know nothing to hinder, but imposition of hands also in his ordination *ought to be used towards him again.* For so Paul the Apostle received imposition of hands, twice at least, from Ananias. Acts 9, 17, and 13, 3."

"Chap. 10. *Of the power of the Church and its Presbytery.* Supreme and lordly power over the churches upon earth doth only belong to Jesus Christ, who is king of the church, and the head thereof. He hath the government upon his shoulders, and hath all power given to him both in heaven and earth. 2. A company of professed believers, ecclesiastically confederate, as they are a church before they have officers and without them, so, even in that estate, subordinate church power under Christ delegated to them by him doth belong to them in such a manner as is before expressed, (chap. 5th, sec. 2d,) and as flowing from the very nature and essence of a church—it being natural unto all bodies, and so unto a church body, to be furnished with sufficient power for its own preservation and subsistence. 3. This government of the church is a mixed government, (and so has been acknowledged long before the term of *independency* was heard of.) In respect of Christ, the head and king of the church, and the sovereign power residing in him and exercised by him, it is a monarchy. In respect of the body or brotherhood of the church, and power from Christ granted to them, it resembles a democracy. In respect of the Presbytery, and power committed to them, it is an aristocracy. 4. The sovereign power which is peculiar unto Christ is exercised. 1. In calling the church out of the world into a holy fellowship with himself. 2. In instituting the ordinances of his worship, and appointing his ministers. 3. In giving laws for the ordering of all his ways, and the ways of his house. 4. In giving power and life to all his institutions, and to his people by them. 5. In protecting and delivering his church against and from all the enemies of their peace.

"5. The power granted by Christ unto the body of the church and *brotherhood is a prerogative or privilege* which the church doth exercise. 1. In choosing their own officers, whether Elders or Deacons. 2. In the admission of members. And therefore there is great reason they should have power to remove any from their fellowship again. Hence, in case of offence, any brother hath power to convince and admonish an offending brother; and, in case of not hearing him, to take one or two more to see on the admonition; and, in case of not hearing them, to proceed to tell the church; and as his offence may require, the whole church has power to proceed to the censure of him, whether by admonition or excommunica-

tion; and, upon his repentance, to restore him again unto his former communion.

"6. In case an Elder offend" [whether a preaching or Ruling Elder, for they are *received and excluded* alike without any discrimination] "incorrigibly, the matter so requiring, as the church had power to call him to office, so they have power according to order (the counsel of other churches where it may be had directing thereto) to remove him from his office, and being now but a member, in case he add contumacy to his sin, the church that had power to receive him into their fellowship hath also the same power to cast him out that they have concerning any other member.

"7. Church government or rule is placed by Christ in the officers of the church, who are therefore called rulers, while they rule with God. Yet, in case of mal-administration, they are subject to the powers of the church, as hath been said before. The Holy Ghost [by the Scriptures it is presumed] frequently, yea, always, where it mentioneth church rule and church government, ascribeth it to Elders. Whereas the work and duty of the people is expressed in the phrase of *obeying their Elders, and submitting themselves unto them in the Lord.* So it is manifest that an organic or complete church is a body politic, consisting of some that are governors and some that are governed in the Lord.

"8. The power which Christ hath committed to Elders is to feed and rule the church of God, and accordingly to call the church together upon any weighty occasion—when the members so called, without just cause, may not refuse to come; nor, when they are come, depart before they are dismissed; nor speak in the church before they have leave from the Elders; nor continue so doing, when they require silence; nor may they oppose or contradict the judgment or sentence of the Elders, without sufficient and weighty cause—because such practices are manifestly contrary unto order and government, and inlets of disturbance and confusion.

"9. It belongs also unto the Elders, before, to examine any officers or members before they be received of the church; to receive the accusations brought to the church, and to prepare them for the church's hearing. In handling of offences, and other matters before the church, they have power to declare and publish the will of God touching the same, and to pronounce sentence, *with the consent of the church.* Lastly, when they dismiss the people, to bless them in the name of the Lord.

"10. The power of government in the Elders doth not in any wise prejudice the power of privilege in the brotherhood; as neither the power of privilege in the brethren doth prejudice the power of government in the Elders; but they may sweetly agree together, as we may see in the example of the Apostles, who were furnished with the greatest church

power, yet took in the concurrence and consent of the brethren in church administrations.

"11. From the premises, namely, that the ordinary power of government belongeth only to the Elders, the power of privilege remaining with the brotherhood, (as the power of judgment in matters of censure, and power of liberty in matters of liberty,) it followeth, therefore, that in an organic church and right administration, all church acts proceed after the manner of a mixed administration, so as no church act can be consummated or perfected without the consent of both."

Some short extracts from Chap. 15th, *Of the communion of churches one with another.* "1. Although churches be distinct, and therefore may not be confounded one with another, and so are equal, therefore they have not dominion one over another. Yet all the churches ought to preserve church communion one with another, because they are all united to Christ, not only as a mystical but as a political head.

"2. The communion of churches is exercised several ways. 1. By mutual care in taking thought for one another's welfare. 2. By way of consultation one for another, &c. 3. By way of admonition, &c. 4. By way of participation, i. e. willingly admitting to the Lord's table members from one church to another. 5. By dismissing and recommending members from one church to another. And 6. By furnishing one another with suitable officers, and temporal supplies when need requires and ability is given."

"Chap. 16th. *Of Synods.* 1. Synods, orderly assembled and rightly proceeding according to the pattern given in Acts 15, we acknowledge as the ordinance of Christ, and though not absolutely necessary to the being, yet many times, through the iniquity of men and perverseness of the times, necessary to the well-being of churches, for the establishment of truth and peace therein.

"2. Synods being spiritual and ecclesiastical assemblies, are therefore made up of spiritual and ecclesiastical causes. The next efficient cause of them, under Christ, is the power of the churches in sending Elders and other Messengers, who, being met together in the name of Christ, are the matter of a Synod. And they, in arguing and debating and determining matters of religion, *according to the Word of God*, and publishing the same to the churches it concerneth, do put forth the proper and formal acts of a Synod, to the conviction of errors and heresies, and the establishment of truth and peace in the churches, which is the end of a Synod."

3. Respects the power of the magistrate to call Synods, which is now exploded.

"4. It belongeth unto Synods and Councils to debate and *determine* controversies of faith, and cases of conscience; to deduce clearly, from

the Word of God, holy directions for the holy worship of God and good government of the church; to bear witness against mal-administration, and corruption in doctrine or manners, in any particular church, and to give directions for the reformation thereof; not to exercise church censures in way of discipline, nor any other act of church authority or jurisdiction, from which that presidential Synod [of Jerusalem, Acts 15—see first section] did forbear.

"5. The Synod's directions and determinations, *so far as consonant to the Word of God*, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement therewith, (*which is the principal ground thereof, and without which they bind not at all*,) but also, secondly, for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God appointed thereunto in his Word.

"6. Because it is difficult if not impossible for many churches to come together in one place, in their members universally, therefore they may assemble by their Delegates or Messengers—as the church of Antioch went not all to Jerusalem, but sent some select men for that purpose—because none are or should be more fit to know the state of the churches, nor to advise of ways for the good thereof, than Elders. Therefore it is fit that in the choice of Messengers for such Assemblies, they have special respect to such. Yet inasmuch as not only Paul and Barnabas, but certain others also, were sent to Jerusalem, not only the Apostles and Elders, but other brethren also, do meet and assemble about the matter. Therefore Synods are to consist both of Elders and other church members, endued with gifts, and sent by the churches, not excluding the presence of any brethren in the churches."

After these copious extracts from the Cambridge Platform, a few historical facts and additional illustrations will now be given. See Mather's Magnalia, book 5, p. 39, folio edition.

Historical remark upon the Discipline. "When the Platform of Church Discipline had been presented by the Synod to the General Court which called it, several persons from several churches gave into the court some objections against sundry passages and paragraphs of this Platform. The secretary did by order lay these written objections before the chief and most of the Ministers of the Colony, by whom Mr. Richard Mather was appointed to answer them. His answer was approved by the rest and given in. The result of all was, that this Ecclesiastical Model, thus fortified, obtained a more abundant recommendation unto and among the people of God. The churches have cheerfully embraced it, and practised upon it, and prospered under it to this day.

"More than thirty years afterwards, [i. e. about the year 1680,] there was another Synod of all the churches in the Colony, assembled at Boston, wherein a vote was taken, 'whether the Platform of the Church Discipline were approved by that Assembly.' Upon which, both the Elders and brethren unanimously lifted up their hands in the affirmative. This is the record upon the occasion: 'A Synod of the churches in the Colony of Massachusetts, being called by General Court to convene at Boston, the 10th of September, 1679, [other places in this same author say 1680,] having read and considered the Platform of Church Discipline, agreed upon by the Synod assembled at Cambridge, anno 1648, do unanimously approve of the said Platform, *for the substance of it*, desiring that the churches may continue steadfast in the order of the Gospel, according to what is therein declared from the Word of God.'" "Now," (says Cotton Mather,) "there is in that clause *(for the substance of it)* which must be explained, by acknowledging that there are several *circumstantials* in the Platform, which are disputed by many judicious ministers of the present generation, who, upon long inquiry and experience, think that in those points the Platform indeed is not *substantial*."

Reader we will now entertain ourselves with a few particulars. The first ground of difference was that part of the Platform which admits that a Minister may administer the sacraments in other congregations besides his own, when requested so to do. This will be passed over.

Page 40, Magnalia. "Another point in the Platform not universally received is, the distinct office of Ruling Elders to join with the Pastors in those acts of church rule which are distinct from the ministry of the Word and sacraments; or to watch over the conversation of the church members with authority. There are some who cannot see any such office as that of Ruling Elder directly appointed in the Word of God. And the inconveniences whereunto many churches have been plunged by Ruling Elders, who were not of such a number, nor of such wisdom as were desirable, have much increased a prejudice against the office itself, arising partly through a prejudice against the office itself, and partly, but chiefly, through a penury (rather scarcity) of men well qualified for the discharge of the duties of it, as it has heretofore been understood and applied. Our churches are now generally destitute of such *helps in government*. On the other side, there are others, who, if asked, what order is there in the Word of God for lay Elders? would answer, that, properly speaking, the only lay Elders known to be in any church are the *Chancellors* in the Church of England—persons *entrusted* with the *Rules* of the church, and yet not ordained unto any office in it. But unless the church have divers *Elders*,

the church government must become either prelatical or popular; and that a church should need but *one Elder* is an opinion contrary not only to the common sense of the faithful, in all ages, but also to the laws of Scripture, where there can be nothing plainer, than *Elders who rule well, and yet are worthy of double honour, though they do not labour in word and doctrine;* whereas, if there were any Teaching Elders who do not labor in word and doctrine, they would be so far from *being worthy of double honour* that they would not be worthy of any honour at all."

"Such things as these have been offered unto the consideration of the diversely persuaded, and accordingly in a meeting of Ministers that had been diversely persuaded in this matter, at Cambridge, an unanimous vote was passed for these conclusions." Mat. Mag. p. 41.

"*Proposition concerning the office of Ruling Elders.* 1. Though the *Pastors* of churches are *originally* entrusted with the whole care of what is to be done in *feeding* and *ruling* of the societies whereof the Holy Ghost hath made them *overseers*, yet the wisdom and goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ has made provision for their *assistance* in the management of these church affairs, which would otherwise too much encumber them, in devoting themselves unto the *Word of God and prayer.*

"2. Ruling Elders are appointed unto the assistance of their Pastors in the government of their churches and the inspection of the flocks. And although these officers may not be furnished with all those attainments which are necessary to a Pastor, yet, if they are so accomplished as that they may be helps to their Pastor in the management of their church rule, they may be chosen thereto, with much benefit and advantage to the people of God.

"3. Whereas it is the business of the Ruling Elder to assist his Pastor in visiting the distressed—instructing the ignorant—reducing the erroneous—comforting the afflicted—advising the defective—rebuking the unruly—discovering the state of the whole flock—exercising the discipline of the Gospel upon offenders—and promoting the desirable growth of the church—it is necessary that he be a person of wisdom, courage, leisure, and exemplary holiness and gravity, agreeable to such employments.

"4. Another passage in the Platform, which hath been but rarely practised, and as little approved, is, 'That in churches where there are no Elders, imposition of hands for the ordination of Elders may be performed by some of the brethren, orderly chosen by the church thereunto;' which indeed is mollified by a concession, 'that in churches where there are no Elders, and the church so desire, the imposition of hands may be performed by the Elders of other churches.' It was the opinion of these

worthy men that the *call* and *power*, whereby a Pastor becomes (indeed the first) recipient subject, is derived unto him from the Lord Jesus Christ, by the choice of a church inviting him to the pastoral care of their souls. The *essence* of his vocation they judged was in an *election* by the multitude of the faithful, agreeing to submit themselves unto his conduct in the Lord, and his acceptance of, and compliance with, that *election*. *Ordination* they looked upon but as a ceremony whereby *a called minister* was declared, *by imposition of hands*, to be solemnly set apart for his *ministry:* and in the same rite, the assistances and protections, and manifold blessings of the Holy Ghost, in the exercise of his ministry are solemnly implored for him.

"Briefly, they did not reckon *ordination* to be essential to the *vocation* of a minister, any more than *coronation* to the being of a king; but that it is only a consequent and convenient *adjunct* of his *vocation*, and a solemn acknowledgment of it, with a useful and proper benediction *of him* in it.

"On the other side, because the Scriptures so expressly mention the laying on of *the hands of the Presbytery*, very judicious men, throughout the country, were altogether averse to *the laying on of the hands of the Fraternity*. They reckoned that in the imposition of hands there was their consecration to their ministry; and by this consecration, they were to be owned as admitted into the order of Pastors through the whole church of God. But they could not allow the rites of this order to be regularly and conveniently performed by any but such as were themselves of the same order; which persuasion has been so general that, setting aside a few Plebeian ordinations in the beginning of the world here among us, there have been rarely any ordinations managed in our churches, but by the hands of Presbyters; yea, any ordinations but such would be but matters of discourse and wonder."

There was a fourth difficulty arising out of the Cambridge Platform, respecting the qualifications entitling a person to membership, upon which there was a diversity of opinion in those early times, but they shall be passed over as not important to the case in hand.

See Mat. Mag. p. 43. B. 5. "I have now reported the most contested passages of our Platform. Nevertheless, to give a further elucidation of some other passages in that Platform, I will subjoin the determination given by a late Assembly of our Ministers at Cambridge upon these two points—the power of Synods and the power of Elders.

"*Propositions concerning the power of Synods, with respect to particular churches.* 1. Particular churches having the same original ends and

interests, and being mutually concerned in the good and evil of each other, there is the light of nature, as well as of Scripture, to direct the meeting of churches by their Delegates, to consult and conclude things of common concernment unto them.

"2. Synods duly composed of Messengers chosen by those whom they are to represent, and proceeding with a due regard to the will of God in his Word, are to be reverenced as *determining* the mind of the Holy Spirit concerning things necessary to be received and practised, in order to the edification of the churches therein represented.

"3. All the commands of God, which bid us *be well advised, and to regard a multitude of counsellors*, do particularly oblige us with reverence to entertain the advice of Synods assembled in the name and fear of the Lord Jesus Christ, for an inquiry after his directions, and if one church be to be heard, much more are many to be so, in things that properly fall under the cognizance thereof.

"4. Synods being of *Apostolic example*, recommended as a necessary ordinance, it is but reasonable that their judgments be acknowledged as *decisive* in the affairs for which they are ordained, and to deny them the power of such a judgment is to render a necessary ordinance of *none effect*.

"5. The power of Synods is not to *abate*, much less *destroy*, the liberties of particular churches, but to *strengthen* and *direct* those churches in the *right use* of the powers given by the Lord Jesus Christ unto them. And such assemblies are therefore to be used as a relief ordained by God for those difficulties for which the *care* and *state* of a particular church afford not a sufficient remedy."

"*Propositions concerning the power of Elders in the government of the Churches.* 1. The power of church government belongs only to the Elders of the church." [It is presumed, both Teaching and Ruling Elders, where they do exist.] "The names of Elders, in the Scripture, are but insignificant and unintelligible metaphors, if the rule of the church be not *only* in the hands of its Elders. The Word of God has ordered the people *to obey the Elders* of the church, as having the *rule* over their souls. An ability to rule well is a qualification particularly required of the Elders of the church, that they may be able to take due care of it. *Governments* are enumerated among those things in the church which pertain not unto all, but to some only. Now, who but Elders? Were the government of the church as much in the brethren as in the Elders, then the whole body were all eye, which it is not.

"2. There are certain cases wherein the Elders, in the management of their church government, are to take the concurrence of the fraternity,

namely, in elections, admissions, and censures. Hence, in such things, we find the injunctions of the Scripture addressed to the whole church. Hence, again, all antiquity assures us that such matters were, in the primitive churches, always done, *consentiente plebe.* Otherwise, the brethren of the church might be obliged to do things wherein they could not *act in faith*, or be conscientiously satisfied that such things ought to be done.

"3. Nevertheless, the Pastor of a church may, by himself, authoritatively suspend from the Lord's table a brother accused or suspected of a scandal, till the matter may be regularly examined into. Our Lord forbids the coming of such an offender to his altar, even if one of less or of no authority in the church do signify a reasonable dissatisfaction. The Pastors of the church are the Porters of the Temple, empowered sufficiently to detain such as they see with moral uncleanness upon them. And it belongs unto the Porters of the church to direct the brethren in the application of the *necessary discipline.* It is not reasonable, therefore, that they should be bound, in the mean time, to contradict their directions by administering the Lord's Supper to those against whom the discipline is to be exercised by his direction.

"4. But the Elders of the church have a negative on the votes of the brethren, who indeed, in the exercise of their *liberty* and *privilege*, are under the conduct of the Elders. Take away the negative of the Elders, and the necessity of their consent unto such acts, and you take away from them all government whatsoever, and it would be to turn the whole regimen of the church into a pure democracy. And if the affirmative of the brethren can supersede the negative of the Elders, or the necessity of their consent, either the Elders may be driven to do things quite contrary to the light of their consciences, or else the brethren may presume to do things which belong not unto them."

A pretty full account has now been given of all the Platforms, or systems of government, adopted at different times by the Congregationalists of New England. The Assembly of Ministers, referred to by Mather, which adopted the modifications of the Cambridge Platform, last quoted, *respecting Synods and Ruling Elders*, was composed of Ministers who entertained different sentiments—of whom, some were more in favor of Presbyterian government than others; and it may be considered as a kind of compromise. This is referred to by Professor Hodge, at page 36, and, as nigh as I can gather, took place somewhere about the year 1660—about three decades, as Mather calls it, before the London plan of Union was entered into, in the year 1689 or 1690—of which Mather speaks in these terms—book 5, page 59:

"Such and so hath been our Platform of church discipline. If our brethren of the Presbyterian persuasion be still uneasy in any article of it, let these things be offered for a close:

"1. The Presbyterian Ministers of this country do find it no difficulty to practise *the substance of it* in and with their several congregations, and when it comes to the practice, they do not find so much difficulty as at first appeared in the *notion*.

"2. The reverend person of the Presbyterian way, who wrote the *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, as long since as the year 1654 declared, 'As we agree wholly in the same confession of faith, so we agree in many things of greatest concernment in matters of church discipline; and those things wherein we differ are not of such consequence as to cause a schism between us, either in worship or in love and affection. Our desires are (as it was said of the disputes of the Ancient Fathers, one with another, about lesser differences) not *contentiones*, but *collationes*. We can truly say, as our brethren do in their Preface, that it is far from us so to attest the discipline of Christ, as to detest the disciples of Christ; so to contest for the seamless coat of Christ, as to crucify the living members of Christ; so to divide ourselves about church communion, as, through breaches, to open a wide gap for a deluge of anti-christian and profane malignity, to swallow up both church and civil state.'

"3. The brethren of the Presbyterian persuasion in England are lately come unto such a happy union with those of the Congregational, that all former names of distinction are now swallowed up in that blessed one of *United Brethren*. And now partly because one of New England, namely, Increase Mather, now resident at London, was very singularly instrumental in effecting that Union, which hath been for many lustres, yea, many decades of years, exemplified in the churches of New England." I shall notice this London Union hereafter.

These copious extracts and documents have been made to guard against a practice, which has become too common, of quoting detached parts, and garbled sentences, and even single words, from an author, to caricature that author, build a system, and draw important conclusions.

From the authorities now produced, we are warranted in drawing the following conclusions:

1. There was not a uniformity of opinion among the early settlers in New England upon some minor points in church polity; each Church and Minister was left at liberty to entertain and practise upon his own system, without interrupting peace and fellowship among themselves.

2. They were almost universally in favor of the opinion that, according to the Scripture account of the permanent officers of the churches, there

ought to be an equality or entire parity among the clergy. Besides their understanding of the Scriptures upon this point, they had seen and felt so sensibly the corrupting and persecuting influence of Prelacy in England, as to give them a great dread and horror of ecclesiastical pre-eminence and domination. They, therefore, so far agreed with strict Presbyterians in sentiment, and could meet with them upon this common ground.

3. Some of the first churches organized went very much upon the Brownonian system of Independence. But, soon after, the prevailing sentiment was in favor of admitting the office of Ruling Elder into the churches, in addition to that of Pastor, and Teacher, and Deacon. These Ruling Elders were to serve as *assistants to the Ministers** in taking the oversight and governing the members of the church, and in exercising discipline upon offending and disorderly individuals; but were to take no part in publicly preaching the Word, and administering the sacraments, further than occasionally, in the absence of the Minister, to give a word of exhortation or counsel to the members. Although this was the prevailing sentiment and practice, especially after the Cambridge Platform had been adopted, yet there were individual Ministers and Churches who preferred a different practice, and forbore the use of Ruling Elders altogether. This difference of sentiment and practice, however, did not interrupt their harmony and fellowship while each one was left to pursue his own course. In admitting the office of Ruling Elder, therefore, they so far agreed with Presbyterians of the Geneva school. But the duties and powers of this office were not so definitely drawn, or distinctly limited, as to form, in connexion with their Pastor and Teacher, a Church Session, separate from the brotherhood or private members of the church, but in many instances the counsel and concurrence of the brotherhood were to be sought and obtained before their acts could have a binding authority. Theirs was, therefore, a kind of mixed government, with mutual checks and balances.

4. They acknowledged and made use of Presbyteries, or judicatories under that name, and might so far be called Presbyterians. But their Presbyteries differed very materially from those of the Geneva or Scotch system. They were not separate, exclusive, or superior, as it related to sessions, with peculiar powers and authority, binding upon an inferior court; but they were in many respects blended together, both in their powers and mode of exercising them, and yet in some respects separate. Theirs was a complicated government, formed, as they said, by a mixture of all the other simple forms of government. As acknowledging Christ as the supreme Head and King of his church, and bound to act in all respects by the rules and direction laid

* This word *Assistant of the Minister* should be remembered, as it will be referred to hereafter as a matter of some consequence.

down in his Word, without which all their enactments would be null and void, their government partook of the nature of a monarchy. The powers given to the Eldership, composed of Teaching and Ruling Elders, whose authority and enactments the brethren were bound to respect and obey, as far as they were thought to be in accordance to the Word of God, made it resemble an aristocracy. The prerogatives and privileges reserved to the brotherhood, and the duties belonging to them, gave it the nature of a democracy. It may not be an easy matter (if at all possible) to understand what limits to set to these entirely distinct simple forms of government—in what proportions to mix them to make them so amalgamate as not to conflict with each other. There appears to some persons to be something of a confusion of ideas and an inconsistency or incohereney of principle in this Platform, which it would be impracticable to analyze. It seems, in the estimation of some, to partake of one grand defect—the want of energy or authority. But the safeguard and guaranty to liberty, which is hereby afforded, may be a sufficient offset to this apparent defect—the want of power. Whether it be safer to trust depraved man with too much liberty, or too much power, is a problem of difficult solution. And what checks and balances to apply, so as to preserve that degree of each most conducive to man's happiness, is a task which would be as difficult of performance. A defective system, administered by the meekness of wisdom, and the true spirit of benevolence, may produce the happiest results; and the most perfect form of polity, in unskilful or ambitious hands, may effect issues disastrous in the exact ratio of its excellences and efficiency.

If one may judge of the Platform of the Pilgrim Puritans, from the peace, harmony, and prosperity which their churches experienced for a length of time under its operation, we may probably come to the conclusion that it was not as defective as it appears to be to many, or that their churches have been administered with a prudence and discretion which certainly do them much credit.

If the liberty be taken of selecting certain words and sentences, in respect to the power and authority ascribed to the Presbytery, or Eldership, and the obligation to obedience and submission on the part of the brethren, it might be proved that they were in substance Presbyterians. On the other hand, if the prerogatives, and privileges, and liberties which are reserved for the brotherhood were collected together by themselves, some persons would calculate upon nothing but anarchy and confusion. Ex parte statements of either kind would manifest an equal departure from truth or justice.*

* It is worth notice that this is the very objection that Dr. Green, in his Christian Advocate, makes to the adopting act of the Synod in 1729; and this is the prevailing complaint of our reforming brethren to this day. They say it leaves nothing of Presbyterianism to the

But how came these Puritan Fathers to devise and adopt this mixed form of government, partaking of the nature both of democratic independence and the energy of strict Presbyterianism, and yet differing from both? Was it the spontaneous and consentaneous expression of their own sentiments, formed from their own reflection, observation, and experience? Or was it a compromise arising from conflicting opinions among themselves, as the best that could be agreed upon for the peace? This latter is Professor Hodge's theory. The subject will be examined hereafter, after a few more remarks respecting the polity adopted by the New England settlers.

5. The only ecclesiastical judicatories of common and constant use were a Congregational Presbytery, which included, in substance, both the Session and Presbytery as in use among Presbyterians. Their Presbytery consisted only of the Minister or Ministers of a particular church, with their Ruling Elders, if they had any, and in connexion with the brotherhood or church members.

The members, before admission, were first to be examined by the Eldership, and then proposed to the brethren for admission. The same was done in the choice of officers of the church before election; which choice was always to be confirmed by the brotherhood: the same course was pursued in exercising discipline and inflicting censures.

Ordination was performed by the Presbytery of the church, or Congregational Presbytery, with the imposition of hands, by the Eldership. But if there were no Minister or Elder, it was permitted, and sometimes done, by some of the brotherhood selected for that service; or, if convenient and desired, it might be done by the Elders of a neighboring church, invited to perform that ceremony.

The rite of ordination, and the constituent members of their Presbyteries, differ materially from strict Presbyterianism. When a Minister or Ruling Elder removed from one church to another, ordination was sometimes repeated, and sometimes not. Great liberality was exercised in tolerating different usages in things which were considered as merely circumstantial, in opposition to what was thought to be essential.

As the brethren had the right of electing their officers, whether ministerial or ruling, so they, in case of delinquency, mal-administration, or contumacy, had the right of judging and deposing from office; which deposition reduced them to a private rank, and from the rank of private membership they could exclude or excommunicate them. This is anti-presbyterial.

church but the name, &c. And this is conclusive proof that the Mother Presbytery and Synod had a closer affinity with Congregationalism than the rigid Scotch system. But Professor Hodge has made other discoveries, and the party applaud him, and let all else to the contrary go for nothing.

The brotherhood, or members, might form a church without any officer, and exercise all church power among themselves.

6. Besides the ordinary or common Church Court, called the Presbytery, they made use of an extraordinary one, when occasion required, which was called a Synod. Synods were rarely used, and only upon some extraordinary occasion, and were generally convened by the call of the civil authority. Synods consisted of the Elders and Messengers delegated by the churches of a certain State or Territory. Sometimes Laymen might be sent by churches as Messengers instead of Elders; yet Professor Hodge says this Platform contained all the essential features of Presbyterianism. The acts and decisions of Synods were to be considered as binding, if judged to be *according to the Word of God*, but not otherwise; and others had a right to judge whether they were so or not. They were not allowed to inflict any church censures, exercise discipline, or perform any act of church authority.

7. The practice of using Ruling Elders was very variable, and in the same church at different times. Sometimes they were very generally dispensed with, and at other times insisted upon as more important in the churches.*

Having thus ascertained what kind of church government was introduced and continued in use in the New England churches, we are now prepared to inquire why they were led to adopt that particular form of church government. Was it because they were generally agreed in preferring this system? Or was there much diversity of sentiment among them, so that the system was adopted as a compromise, that as many as possible might be brought to consent to it for the sake of peace?

The overwhelming majority of the Puritans who settled in New England had belonged to the Episcopal Church, established in England, and would willingly have continued in that connexion, if they could have been permitted to forbear the use of certain rites and ceremonies which they believed were contrary to the Scriptures, and were of pernicious tendencies, having been heretofore superstitiously used by the Church of Rome; but they were obliged to observe them contrary to their consciences, or subject themselves to heavy fines and imprisonment. They had made frequent attempts to

* Whenever Ruling Elders were dispensed with, the duties of Ruling Elders were performed by the Deacons, or Assistants, as they were formerly called; but, of late years, the name of the persons by which these duties are performed was that of Committee men. The duties were all performed, but the name given to the officers performing them was changed. This is now considered a radical disorder, which would vitiate the whole system with all their doings.

obtain a reformation, or an abatement of the rigor with which they were enforced; but, in proportion as they strove for a reformation, they were persecuted with more violence, until the only alternative left them was to comply in all things with the act of uniformity, or fly from their country. They had never formed any ecclesiastical connexion among themselves incompatible with their remaining connected with the establishment. A few of them had entered into societies among themselves, for mutual counsel, comfort, and edification, but still retained their connexion with the Church of England; but this gave such offence that they were forced to give them up. A party of them had fled a few years before to Holland, under their Minister, Mr. Robinson, and had become independents in church government. These exiles, feeling unpleasant among strangers, formed the first company who settled at Plymouth, and the first church they organized was very much upon the same independent plan, and was almost entirely congregational, or democratical, in its system of government. But as the colony increased, and the Ministers and Churches became more numerous, they became more dependent upon one another for counsel and advice, and their congregational prejudices began to abate till they formed the Cambridge Platform. There were several causes which led to this change of sentiment and system. The troubles in England, between the Parliament on the one hand, and Charles I on the other, had so employed all parties there, that the persecution of the Puritans had ceased, and their friends in Parliament had gained the ascendancy, taken the reins of government into their own hands, and had broken not only the power of the persecuting Bishops, but the religious establishment itself. The Puritans not only ceased to emigrate to New England, but the current was so far turned that many began to return, from the hardships of a new settlement in the wilderness, to the old comfortable homes they had been compelled to forsake.

Controversies upon the subject of religion, as well as politics, became the order of the day, which upturned and unsettled every thing. The colony in New England entered warmly into all these discussions, and was drawn into the vortex of revolutionary principles. The Parliament of England had convened the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, to assist them in forming a new religious establishment, to take the place of the old, which had been abolished. The Scotch nation were earnestly solicited by the Parliament to join them in their war against their King and the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and make a common cause with them; which they refused to do, unless they would join them in entering into their solemn league and covenant against Popery, Prelacy, Heresy, Schism, &c.; and as it was a very critical period in England, and the Parliamentary cause was at a low ebb, the Scotch nation, which could easily turn the scale either way, had an oppor-

unity of forcing upon them what terms they pleased. Hence, not only the Parliament and Westminster Assembly were both induced to take the Scotch solemn league and covenant, but the whole English people were ordered to take it also. Scotch Divines were invited and admitted into the Westminster Assembly, who brought their paramount influence and authority with them into that Assembly; and New England Divines were also invited to come over and take part in that Assembly, in settling the form of religion which was to be common to them all; which, however, they declined. Both Prelacy and Independence were put down by that Assembly, and Presbyterianism was declared to be the system by which they were all to be governed, and so was proclaimed to be the established system in England, as well as in Scotland. Hence Presbyterianism, which hitherto had been professed by very few in England, came into favor, and the whole nation, for awhile, were made Presbyterians by law.

During this state of things, in the year 1643, "Several persons arriving at Boston attempted to establish Presbyterian government, under the authority of the Assembly at Westminster, which met this year, but they were baffled by the General Court."*

This is the first attempt that was made to introduce the Presbyterian form of government into New England that is to be met with. How was it met? It was instantly put down, and frowned into contempt. It was an attempt, on the part of Presbyterians, to change their former systems of church polity, and to revolutionize them in the same manner as the Church of England had been revolutionized by the authority of the British Parliament. It was the arrogance of bigotry and intolerance, and it was treated by the determined spirit of the Pilgrims exactly as it deserved. This was not a likely way to make a favorable impression for Presbyterianism, but to create disgust. Mather's Magnalia has this statement, page 23, book 1: "Before the woful wars which broke forth in the three kingdoms, there were divers gentlemen in Scotland, who, being uneasy under the ecclesiastical burdens of the times," [during their oppression by Charles I,] "wrote over to New England their inquiries: Whether they might be there suffered freely to exercise their Presbyterian church government? and it was freely answered, *That they might*. Hereupon they sent over an agent, who pitched upon a tract of land near the mouth of Merrimack river, whither they *intended then* to transplant themselves. But, although they had so far proceeded in their voyage as to be half-seas through, the manifold crosses they met withal made them give over their intentions; and the providence of God so ordered it, that some of those very gentlemen were afterwards the *reviveers*

*See Holmes's Annals for the year 1643, page 271.

of that well-known *Solemn League and Covenant* which had so great an influence upon the following circumstances of the nations. However, the number of those who did actually arrive in New England before the year 1640, have been computed at about 4,000; since which time, far more have gone out of the country than have come into it: and yet the God of Heaven so smiled upon the Plantations while under an easy and equal government, that the designs of Christianity, *in well-formed churches*, have been carried on so as no history can parallel it." Inferences drawn from this quotation: 1. The mild and tolerant nature of the government of New England respecting other sects settling among them, especially Presbyterians, may be learned. 2. Presbyterians, *as such*, had not as yet settled in the colony, nor did they know they would be permitted to do so; for, if other Presbyterians had already settled there, it might have been known that they would be tolerated, without this formal message of inquiry. 3. This emigration of Presbyterians from Scotland proved an entire failure, and was abandoned, and some of the ringleaders of the scheme were the chief promoters of the ill-judged, illiberal, and pernicious league and covenant which produced such serious consequences to the nations concerned, and ultimately prostrated the Presbyterian cause in England.

Who the 4,000 settlers were that arrived before 1640, whence they came, or of what religious sect, we are not informed. If they were all Scotch Presbyterians, as is contended by some, they must have probably been the majority of the whole colony of Massachusetts at that time, although Bancroft is quoted as asserting that "it was estimated that about 21,200 emigrants had arrived in New England before 1640." Professor Hodge proceeds, and says: "Cotton Mather tells us that, previous to that same year, 4,000 *Presbyterians had arrived*."* This writer has a talent

*Let Bancroft's and Mather's and Professor Hodge's statements be compared together, and results are produced which might bewilder any one. Bancroft says that, prior to 1640, about 41,200 *emigrants* had arrived in New England. Professor Hodge contends strenuously, in the greater part of his introductory chapter, that the majority of the Puritans, by whom New England was settled, were *decidedly*, and, *to all important purposes, good Presbyterians;* and then quotes Cotton Mather as proof for saying, "that, before the year 1640, 4,000 *Presbyterians* had settled in New England." But Professor Hodge's authorities do not agree well together to bring about his favorite conclusion; for Mather's 4,000 Presbyterians, if they had ever existed, would not make a majority of Bancroft's emigrants by a great way.

But, upon a close inspection of the quotation from Mather which Professor Hodge so much relies upon, it will be seen that he has totally misapprehended, and, therefore, misrepresented Mather. What led the Professor astray was, that the statement of Mather respecting the 4,000 followed in the next paragraph after he had spoken of the failure of the Scotch enterprise; and, as the Scotch were known to be Presbyterians, the Professor, in

for jumbling together authorities and dates in a very loose manner, and quoting his authors very partially, to answer a favorite purpose; "his zeal sometimes gets ahead of his discretion." He makes Cotton Mather say that 4,000 Presbyterians had arrived in Massachusetts before 1640. There is no doubt but he thought Mather meant that, and therefore he makes him say it; whereas Mather says no such thing, for he does not mention the word Presbyterian at all in that connexion. This affords evidence that what Professor Hodge says about Presbyterians must be received with great caution, for he can find Presbyterians almost every where, and manufacture them out of materials of every kind, when he wishes to get them together to form the Mother Presbytery at its commencement, as we shall see more fully hereafter.

After this apparent digression, the further history of the Cambridge Platform will be resumed. This famous instrument has a clause in it respecting Synods, telling who were to compose such an Assembly, and with what powers they were invested. There are one or two terms used upon these points which claim a passing remark or two: "Synods, duly composed

his eagerness for proof, concluded that those afterwards spoken of were all Presbyterians also; but, unfortunately for Professor Hodge, Mather, in this last paragraph, says not a word about Presbyterians.

Mather's object evidently was, to account for the great increase and prosperity of New England but a short time before 1640. For this purpose, he first mentions a company which had been formed in Scotland, in these warlike and troublesome times, for the purpose of emigrating to, and settling in New England; which project had, however, failed, and been abandoned. He then mentions the great influx of settlers which had taken place just before 1640, though, after that period, from the favorable state of things in England, more of the Puritans returned to England than came out. By referring to Holmes's Annals and Rees's Encyclopedia we learn these facts: 1st. That, in the year 1635, Sir Henry Vane, a talented and aspiring young man, who had become dissatisfied with the oppressive measures pursued by Charles II, at the instigation of the Earl of Stafford and Archbishop Laud, had joined with about 3,000 of his countrymen, who were thorough Independents and Republicans, and emigrated to New England. This made Sir Henry Vane so popular in New England that the next year (1636) he was chosen Governor of Massachusetts; but, being of a restless and aspiring temper, he became a ringleader of Mrs. Ann Hutchinson's party of Antinomian Familists. He was thereupon displaced, and returned home to England; how many of his followers returned with him we are not informed. This took place in 1637. In the year 1638, twenty ships, with about 3,000 more settlers arrived in New England. In the year 1639, the whole number of militia-men in Massachusetts amounted to but 1,000 men, who were enrolled in two regiments. In the year 1640, Episcopacy and Monarchy were put down in England, and the current of emigration was changed. This is what Mather was narrating in his history. Has not our Professor assumed his premises carelessly, reasoned loosely, and then jumped at his conclusion with a Q. E. D.?

of Messengers chosen by those whom they are to represent, and proceeding *with a due regard to the Word of God*, are to be reverenced *as determining* the mind of the Spirit concerning things necessary to be received and practised in order to the edification of the churches therein represented."* If one wished to establish the position that Synods, or superior courts, had of course power to control, govern, and direct inferior courts, in all such things as they might judge proper, he might plead this detached sentence from the Cambridge Platform as favoring such a doctrine; and this has actually been done. But we have more to the same effect: "The third position is, Synods being of Apostolical example, recommended as a necessary ordinance, it is but reasonable that their judgment be acknowledged *as decisive* in [and of] the affairs for which they are ordained; and to deny them the power of such a judgment, is to render a necessary ordinance of none effect."† But the emphatic words, *decisive* and *determining*, just quoted, stand connected with another sentence: "Synods, proceeding with a due regard to the *will of God* in his *Word*, are to be reverenced *as determining* the mind of the Holy Spirit," &c. Now, supposing Synods should evidently err in judgment, and not proceed with a due regard to the Word of God—Synods often have erred in these respects—what remedy have those who occupy inferior stations? The answer from high-toned churchmen would be, *none*, *absolutely none*, but submission and acquiescence. Admit this doctrine and grant this power, and passive obedience to infallible power follows of course. This was the road the church travelled from primitive purity and simplicity to Papal infallibility and anti-Christian domination. But if, in order to give them the indisputable right to decide and determine, they were bound to adhere *strictly to the Word of God*, it would belong to others to judge how far, or whether at all, they did proceed with a due regard to the Scriptures of Truth; and should they see clearly that they had departed from that infallible rule, they were to consider those acts of no valid authority. But to allow those Synods the power of doing whatever they chose, and then give them the power of judging whether they did right or not, would be to establish absolute and despotic power at once. However such sentiments might please other times and persons, they were never entertained by the free and republican Puritans. They always reserved to themselves the right of judging for themselves. The 16th section of the Platform provides, section 4: "It belongeth unto Synods, &c. to bear witness against mal-administra-

*See Professor Hodge's Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church, page 33.

†See Professor Hodge's late work, page 36, and elsewhere. "Here it is evident that the Presbyterial element in those churches predominated."

tion and corruption in doctrine or manners in any particular church, and to give directions for the reformation thereof: *not to exercise church censures in way of discipline, nor any other act of church authority or jurisdiction.*" Again, section 5: "The Synod's directions and determinations, so far as consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission." And in the 10th chapter, respecting Presbyteries, are these words: "Section 10. The power of government in the Elders doth not, in any wise, prejudice the power of privilege in the brotherhood, as neither doth the power of privilege in the brethren prejudice the power of government in the Elders; but they may sweetly agree together, as we may see in the example of the Apostles, who were furnished with the greatest church power, yet took in the concurrence and consent of the brethren in church administration. 11. From the premises, namely, that the ordinary power of government belongeth only to the Elders, the power of privilege remaining with the brotherhood, it follows, therefore, that in an organic church and right administration, all church acts proceed after the manner of a mixed administration, so as no church act can be consummated or perfected without the consent of both."

I shall now give a few of Professor Hodge's extraordinary statements and sweeping assertions, and in his own words: Page 12th. "With regard to church order, it is contended [i. e. by the Old School advocates] that our church *adopted from the beginning*, and has ever continued to exercise, *that form of government which had been previously adopted in Scotland, Ireland, Holland, and among the Protestants of France.* This system was every where, *in all its distinctive and essential features, the same.*" Now we will let Professor Hodge tell us, in his own words, what those distinctive and essential features were: "It required the government of individual congregations to be vested in the Pastor and Elders, and not in the brotherhood." He must, by this, mean *exclusively of the brotherhood.* The reader will remember that this is one of the essential features of Presbyterianism. See now p. 36—here Professor Hodge is describing the character of the Cambridge Platform, which we have given so much in detail: "Here [says he] it is evident that the Presbyterial element in those churches predominated." I would ask, was the brotherhood *included* or *excluded* from all parts of government by the Cambridge Platform? But hear Professor Hodge further, respecting his essential features of Presbyterianism, page 13: "It required the association of several particular churches under one Presbytery, composed of Ministers and Elders." Were the elements of Presbyterianism predominant in the Cambridge Platform in this respect? Is the Presbytery of Geneva formed by the association of several particular churches? or the Classes of France? Does not any one

acquainted with this subject know that these Presbyteries were formed by the collegiate Ministers and Elders of only one metropolitan church, in which they all officiated as colleagues? But again, says Professor Hodge: "It provided for Provincial and National Synods, composed of delegates from the lower courts and recognized as belonging to Synods, *the authority* of review and control, and the *right* to set down *rules* for the *government of the church.*" Are these elements to be found in all the places where Professor Hodge has placed them?

We shall now hear what Professor Hodge says respecting the Saybrook Platform, pages 38, 39: "The Saybrook Platform comes much nearer to the Presbyterial model than that of Cambridge," [although that itself had all the elements predominant.] "The former [says he, i. e. the Saybrook] declares, 1st. That the Elder or Elders of a particular church, *with the consent of the brethren of the same*, have power and ought to exercise discipline, according to the rule of God's word, in relation to all scandals that fall out within the same." Wherein does this differ from the Cambridge Platform?

"2d. That the churches which are neighboring to each other shall consociate for mutual affording to each other such assistance as may be requisite on all occasions ecclesiastical," &c. If he has found in this any power to perform an act of authority or discipline, or any thing more energetic than an advisory council, he can gather more from this language, or the practice which has grown out of it, than I can. But again:

"3d. That all cases of scandal that shall fall out within any one of these Consociations shall be brought to a Council of Elders, and also Messengers, of the churches within the said circuit, i. e. the churches of one consociation, if they see cause to send Messengers, when there shall be need of a council *for the determination of them.*" Thus ends this unfinished sentence, quoted, without any point or meaning attached to it, unless something is to be inferred from that important word *determination*, to which perhaps some hidden or mystical meaning was given. But really arguments must have been very scarce, when such as this is resorted to.

"4th. It declares [says he] that when any case is orderly brought before any Council of the churches, it shall be heard and *determined*, which [unless orderly removed thence] shall be a final issue, and all parties therein concerned shall sit down and be *determined* thereby." The plain and unsophistical meaning of this is, that if, for instance, a dispute shall arise in any church, and the parties concerned shall agree to refer it to a Council or Consociation, and send Messengers to bring it before that body, the decision of that body is to be final, (unless it should be removed elsewhere;) but where else could the cause be carried, except to the church again

from which it came, for there was no higher body than a Consociation? Again, whence did the Consociation or Council derive their power of deciding, except from the voluntary consent of the persons concerned to refer it to them for decision? If the cause was not carried voluntarily to them, they could take no cognizance of it; and, if they did, their decision would be a nullity. Once more:

"If any Pastor or church doth obstinately refuse a due attendance and conformity to the determination of the Council, [after due patience,] they are to be reported guilty of a scandalous contempt, and dealt with as the rule of God's Word in such case doth provide, and the sentence of non-communion shall be declared against such Pastor and church." So much as quoted from the Saybrook Platform.

Now hear Professor Hodge himself, page 39: "In giving, therefore, the exercise of discipline to the Pastor and Elders, and in making the *determination of councils definitive and binding* on pain of non-communion, the Saybrook Platform comes very little short of Presbyterianism." Let the reader attend to a short remark or two upon this very far-fetched and flimsy argument. 1. Was it not sophistical in the last quotation to speak of the Saybrook Platform giving to the Pastors and Elders the power of exercising discipline, without explaining their manner of exercising that discipline, and making their determinations definitive and binding? Was this a candid and honest argument?

2. What was the amount of their sentence of non-communion? Were the churches under any obligation to enter into the Consociation unless they chose, and did the non-communion mean any thing else than that they should no longer be considered as belonging to that associated body? Did that affect their ecclesiastical connexion in any serious manner whatever? There were always churches which never joined those Consociations, and some who would not even associate. Were they, in any way, stigmatized for this? Were they considered and treated as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, or strangers from the covenants of promise? Were they shunned and denounced as schismatics, separatists, seceders, and the like? Or was not their standing, in all other respects, considered as fair and as unquestionable as their other brethren, and they treated and respected as Christian brethren in good standing still? What civil or ecclesiastical disability or stigma attached to them on this account? Does Professor Hodge's argument fit the case to which he applied it? Where, then, was the good Presbyterianism to be found which he thought he had discovered in this excellent Platform? "Optics keen, it needs, I ween."

3. If these Plaforms of Cambridge and Saybrook, which have been the bulwarks of Congregationalism ever since to this day, were such good and

excellent things, containing all the elements of good Presbyterianism, and in some respects even surpassing it, why has the Act of Union of 1801 become such a stumbling block, and even been made to inflict a deadly leprosy upon every thing it came in contact with? Consistency is a jewel.

But it is now time to notice the strange position assumed by our learned Princeton Professor; that is, the right to claim the great majority of the Puritans by whom New England was settled, as well as the Presbyterians of England, as agreeing in all essential points with the strict and consistent Presbyterianism of Scotland. A few extracts will now be given from Professor Hodge's late work:

Page 22. "Hence, it seems to be confidently inferred that all emigrants from Old or New England, bearing the designation, [i. e. Puritan,] must have carried Congregationalism with them wherever they went. Hence, too, it is taken for granted, that if a Minister came into our church from New England, he could not be a Presbyterian. [Who ever made such an assertion? I never heard it before.] This is a mistake. The Congregationalists, or Independents, *were a mere handful* compared to the whole number of the Puritans."

Page 25: "During all this time [i. e. during the Laudean persecution in England] opposers of the Government were called Puritans—a term not expressive of any one set of opinions so much as one common object. Episcopalians who refused to read the book of Sunday sports; Presbyterians who objected to the power of the Bishops; Independents who rejected all government in the church beyond that of a congregation over itself, were all Puritans. Subsequent events proved that the second class [i. e. Presbyterians] was much the most numerous of the three. Even as early as the time of Elizabeth, a large portion of the clergy of the Established Church were *Presbyterians* in principle."

Page 29: "The Act of Uniformity required the re-ordination of those who had been Presbyterially ordained, assent and consent to all and every thing contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer, and the profession of the doctrine of passive obedience. This the Presbyterians could not submit to, and were consequently ejected from the ministry of the church to the number of about 2,000." Here he claims as good Presbyterians all those who were ejected on St. Bartholomew's day. Really his must have been a lively imagination.

Again, page 31: "The truth, however, is, that as the great majority of the Puritans in England were Presbyterians, so no inconsiderable proportion of those who came to America preferred the Presbyterian form of church government."

Quotations to the same amount might easily be multiplied; let these suf-

fice. What was our Professor's object in mustering such a host of Presbyterians at this early period? Answer: 1st. To prove that, in all essential points, they were the same as the Scotch Presbyterians. 2d. To show with what materials American Presbyterianism was composed; all good, sound, orthodox Calvinists—this he asserts—and good substantial Presbyterians upon the strict Scotch system.

Let me give an offset or two to these bold assertions, and from good authority too. First, from another, and a much older and more discreet Professor—from Princeton, too—viz. Dr. Miller. Life of Doctor Rodgers, page 73: "From the origin of the Presbyterian Church, as an organized body, in this country, the materials of which it was composed were, in a considerable degree, *heterogeneous*. The principal constituent parts were strict Presbyterians from Scotland and Ireland, *and Congregationalists from South Britain and New England*." Once more, from the same authority, page 136: "A considerable number of them, [i. e. those persons who formed the first Presbyterian church in New York,] having been accustomed to the less rigid habits of the Presbyterian and Congregational churches of South Britain, were not pleased with the strict Presbyterianism according to the Scottish model," &c.

Common courtesy, one would suppose, should have induced the young hero of Princeton to treat his venerable colleague, now enfeebled with age, with a little more respect; but age affords no protection now.

This being the case, I will next bring upon the arena a spirited youth from the South, who will not be easily outdone in manly daring. Take a quotation from a late periodical, which has issued from the press since Professor Hodge's work has been circulated; whether its author had read the Professor's statement before he penned his philippic, I cannot say. See Watchman of the South, vol. 2, No. 48, July 25, 1839. Doctor Plumer commences his editorial with *English Presbyterians*:

"We have long thought that there was great unfairness in the attempts of some to prejudice the public mind by a reference to English Presbyterians; for, in the first place, these people are not, and never have been, Calvinists in doctrine. For certain purposes, at times, they may have been silent when called Calvinists; but, *it is well known*, they have no title to the appellation. Then, again, they have not adopted the Presbyterian mode of government. Indeed, their polity does not bear as much resemblance to Presbyterianism as American Congregationalism does. It is almost pure Independency. The mere assumption of a name, therefore, cannot be regarded as showing any affinity, or as furnishing any analogy, in an argument against our church government. We are willing to hope that, when this subject has been referred to in argument, *it has been through igno-*

rance, and not because any wished wilfully to misrepresent the real state of things. We also hope that, understanding the subject, all will *hereafter* have the candor to abstain from so great an act of injustice to truth and fairness, as each one must be guilty of who associates our beloved church with Arminian and Socinian Independency, under a name to which it is not, and never has been entitled." When Greek meets Greek, then comes the tug of war. I shall now leave our juvenile Doctors to settle this matter between themselves the best way they can, earnestly hoping, however, they will teach each other a little more discretion before they end their strife.

The arguments drawn by Professor Hodge from the great number of Presbyterians he has produced among the first colonists, and the kind of Presbyterianism they brought with them, have already been noticed. A remark or two will now be made, in addition to what has already been said, respecting the kind of government adopted by the Puritans. Professor Hodge contends that their government partook more of the properties of Presbyterianism than of Congregationalism, and infers that it was the result of a compromise for the sake of peace. He admits that the first organized churches were literally Congregational, and accounts for it, very rationally, on the ground that the first emigrants came from Holland, where they had used that system. This is very nigh the truth; and he accounts for the strong Congregational features which they retained in their system afterwards, from the necessity there was of preserving as much uniformity in their general establishments as possible, to satisfy the civil authority, and from the influence some master-minds of the first colonists exerted in favor of Congregational principles. But the first churches at Plymouth, Salem, Boston, and elsewhere, were perfectly independent of each other. If they chose sometimes to consult and advise with neighboring Ministers, and others, it was merely for advice, and not for authoritative direction. The civil authority never interfered in their fixing the details of their system, but the greatest liberty was allowed all the settlements, and a rigid uniformity was never attempted; and the civil powers never interfered but in the case of some great disorder, or gross departure from doctrines which had been long and generally received by the Reformed Churches; such as Ann Hutchinson's alarming innovations in doctrine and order, and the annoying conduct of some Quaker fanatics, who attempted to prostrate every thing heretofore held sacred and in use among them. And, as to overpowering intellect against them, it is not common for Presbyterians to use so humble a plea in their own behalf. Besides, if they were as numerous as Professor Hodge contends—especially if, as he says, the Independents bore but a small proportion among the Puritans—why did they sacrifice their principles for the sake of peace, when they could have outvoted the rest,

and carried matters in their own way? This yielding, temporising course is a new trait in Presbyterian character, especially among Scotch Presbyterians, with their jure divino claims for every part of their system. If there ever was an instance recorded in history of Scotch Presbyterians pursuing this policy, when they could do otherwise, I have never met with it yet. But they had an easy remedy at hand, if they chose to use it. The Presbyterians could, if as numerous as is contended for, easily have got together and formed churches of their own, upon their own principles; there was nothing to prevent its being done. Is it not more likely they would have done so, than compromise and mix with others when there was no necessity for their doing so?

Cotton Mather informs us that, about seventeen years after the first Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth, during the distressing wars brought upon Scotland by the Laudean persecution in the year 1637, some Scotch gentlemen wrote over to America to know whether they might remove and settle among the Pilgrims, and enjoy the uninterrupted exercise of their Presbyterian mode of worship. They were promptly answered in the affirmative. This was no new privilege which was granted; if it had been their policy from the beginning, as it certainly was, why had not Presbyterian churches been formed before? And why could not these gentlemen in Scotland have received information from their Presbyterian friends and brethren upon this point before, without this formal mode of informing themselves from the constituted authorities? The plain and natural answer to all these questions, and solution of all these difficulties, is this: there were no such zealously strict Presbyterians with them in those days, or at least they were not in sufficient numbers to form churches of their own, else they would have done it.

All Professor Hodge's historical facts, and far-fetched and wire-drawn arguments, to prove that the Pilgrim settlers of New England were generally, or in any great numbers, Presbyterians, weigh nothing against these plain and common-sense observations and conclusions. The Scotch Presbyterians had other work to do at home, and were making other kinds of calculations, to prevent their emigrating to the wilds of America, as yet, in any numbers; and the Puritans in England had never so far Presbyterianized, by forming into a separate connexion from the Established Church, as to undertake such an enterprise. Whatever Presbyterian predilections and preferences were to be found in the New World were confined to isolated individuals; and they were not so bigoted in those sentiments but they could fall in and worship comfortably with their neighbors, who so far overpowered them in numbers.

The first account we hear of Presbyterians in New England was in the

year 1643; when, by the power of the Westminster Assembly, aided by the Solemn League and Covenant, the Scotch influence being paramount in England and Presbyterianism forced upon that nation, some zealous and bigoted Presbyterians came over to Boston, and wished to introduce and establish Presbyterianism by lawful authority there too. Here was a fair opportunity, if Presbyterians were as numerous in New England as Professor Hodge supposes, for them to have chimed in and shown their strength. Did they succeed? Holmes's account is this, page 271, 1st vol.: "Several persons arriving in Boston [this was in 1643] attempted to establish Presbyterian government, under the authority of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, which met this year; but they were baffled by the General Court." See also Chalmers, book 1, page 165, and Hutchinson, 1, 117. This was not a likely way to bring about a compromise, or to introduce their principles for the sake of peace. The fact is, that the rigid and unyielding policy of Presbyterians, together with their intolerant and persecuting spirit in those days, blasted the fairest prospects they ever had of Presbyterianizing both Old and New England, and fixed a stigma upon that society which has not been wiped off from Scotch Presbyterianism to this day.

In the year 1646, the same year in which the Synod met at Cambridge to form the Platform, Holmes mentions this additional fact respecting Presbyterians: "*A few persons*, of some influence in Massachusetts, opposed to its civil and ecclesiastical institutions, and imagining that the Parliament of England would establish the Presbyterian form of church government only, presented a petition to the General Court to establish that form in this colony. The Court being slow to censure them, they associated with themselves *a few more persons*, and framed a bill of complaint, containing gross charges against the government of the colony, with the intention of presenting it to Parliament; but the magistrates detected and suppressed the design. Edward Winslow, already chosen an agent for the colony to answer the complaint of Gorton and other Familists, was now instructed to make defence against those *new adversaries*, who had taken measures to render the colony odious in England. Winslow, by his prudent management, aided by the estimation in which he was held by many members of Parliament, and the principle persons in power, successfully vindicated the colony."

1. We see here another instance of the spirit and temper of strict Presbyterianism, according to the Scotch model.

2. There were but a few to engage in this disgraceful work. Where had Professor Hodge's crowd of Presbyterian Puritans fled to at this time?

3. This was a very unlikely mode of introducing the true elements of Presbyterianism into the Platform, as a compromise for the sake of peace,

by the Synod which was then sitting, and engaged in forming the Cambridge Platform.

The character of Congregationalism in New England was not the modelling of a compromise with Presbyterianism, but the expression of their own uninfluenced opinions and principles.

Congregationalism is a very vague term, and it is not easy to fix any very definite ideas to it, because it has never been reduced, either in theory or practice, to any one uniform system. Congregationalism is often used as synonymous with Independency, whereas there is a manifest difference between them. Again: Congregationalists and Presbyterians are often blended as being the same. If there were any established standard of Congregationalism to which reference might be had, there would be less difficulty in referring to it; but this is not the case. The Cambridge Platform was never universally adopted, for there were always individual ministers and congregations who objected to some of its provisions. And the Platform itself has undergone several amendments and blendings with other systems, at different times, so that it is a very changeable thing.

The Saybrook Platform of Connecticut has undergone fewer changes, and the practice in what is called "*the State of steady habits*" has been less variable. But even in Connecticut entire uniformity in sentiment or practice has never yet been arrived at. Amidst all this variety and fluctuation, there has generally existed throughout New England a great degree of peace and harmony among the churches, because the Puritans, whether known as Independents or Congregationalists, have always been a liberal, tolerant, and forbearing people, one with another, respecting what was considered as non-essential or circumstantial subjects. This has been the true secret which produced their harmony and prosperity. They did not magnify every opinion upon government, nor every doctrinal sentiment or form of expression, into an essential and fundamental principle. They might, at times, have carried this matter too far, as there are no good things which are not liable to abuse. But if this distinction between essential and non-essential points is not made; if all doctrines and all points of order are contended for as essential principles; especially if a jus divinum authority be pleaded, there can be no tolerance nor liberty of conscience. If a finger, or even an arm, should be made as essential to life as the head or the heart, it would be an egregious mistake. This is the true cause of all bigotry, animosity, and persecution among Christians. With a narrow-minded bigot a shibboleth is all-important, and a phrase or mode of expression would cause one to be denounced as a dangerous heretic.

The Independents, or Congregationalists of England, were always advocates for toleration and liberty of conscience, with a few exceptions; and if

the Presbyterians had concurred with them on this point, and not urged their intolerant system, and insisted on revolutionizing England and establishing Presbyterianism in its most rigid form there as well as in Scotland, republicanism would have predominated, and monarchy, with that licentious hypocrite Charles II at its head, never would have been introduced again. A spirit of tolerance on the one hand, and an uncompromising exclusiveness on the other, were the most striking traits of difference between Independence, or Congregationalism, on the one hand, and rigid Scotch Presbyterianism on the other.

To this day, when Congregationalism is spoken of by many, it is with the belief that all church affairs and government are transacted by the brotherhood, or members of the church in general, and that there is no kind of intercourse or connecting link among them. But this is far from being the case, Professor Hodge himself being judge; for he says repeatedly they were, in their forms, more Presbyterian than Congregational. A Presbyterian Minister, as Mather says, could get along with a congregation under this kind of government without much difficulty, as has been done in hundreds of instances in former days.

Professor Hodge acknowledges that the Congregationalists of New England were becoming more and more favorable to Presbyterian principles formerly than of late. What has produced this change? They saw and felt a necessity of a more energetic system than mere Congregationalism would afford; and if it had not been for the grasping at authority, and the illiberal and exclusive policy which they saw in the Presbyterian church, there is reason to believe that, by this time, or at least in process of time, the two denominations would have been melted into one, or would have so compromised their differences as to have improved both systems. But Presbyterians have defeated this desirable event, as they did in England before, in the year 1660, by overstraining the matter, and attempting to bring back the old Scotch system, in all its rigidity and intolerance, into the American churches. I am perfectly aware of the risk I am running in making these remarks; but I am not to be frightened, if the charge of being no Presbyterian, or of being a Congregationalist, should be made against me, while I have Professor Hodge, with the imprimatur of Princeton, testifying to the excellence of the New England Platforms of Government, as containing all the essential elements of the Presbyterian system, and that very good Presbyterian Puritans united in forming those systems, and lived contentedly and usefully under them. But why it is that Congregationalism was so good a thing formerly, and so full of deadly poison now, I confess I am unable to see. *Sed tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur cum illis.* The system is the same—the change in us.

CHAPTER II.

Doctor Dana's letter respecting Presbyterians in New England—Relative to the colonies, or settlements, formed by the Puritans out of the bounds of New England, and in those regions within which the first Congregations and Ministers of the Presbytery, at its formation, were located—Influence of the Puritans in Virginia—The first settlements on the Delaware river and bay, and the peninsula lying south—The first settlements in Maryland—Doctor Hawk's account of the same—The Union formed between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in London, in 1689 or 1690, by which Union, Makemie and others, were sent as Missionaries to the American Colonies—The manner in which the Reformation was introduced in Scotland, and the genius and character of the Scotch system—The rise, character, &c. of American Presbyterianism contrasted with the strict Scotch plan—The location of the first Presbyterian Ministers with their Congregations—Letters from the Letter Book: 1. To New England Ministers about New Haven—2. To Sir Edmund Harrison—3. To Presbytery of Dublin—4. To Synod of Glasgów—5. To Rev. John Boyle, to be laid before the Presbytery of Dublin—6. Letter of Mr. Andrews to Mr. Prince—Remarks upon the said letter.

Before, however, I proceed to examine into the correctness of Professor Hodge's statements respecting the settlements formed by New Englanders in other parts, I shall take this opportunity of giving extracts from a letter which I received from my venerable friend Doctor Dana, of Newburyport, Massachusetts, dated February 10th, 1838, in answer to one I sent to him requesting information on several queries which I proposed to him. After other preliminary remarks, he proceeds: "I will begin, if you please, with the second of your queries, viz: 'Were not attempts made to introduce Presbyterianism in those bounds (of New England) upon an extensive scale, especially about the time of the Assembly of Westminster Divines, during the Commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell? If so, by whom was this attempt made, and how was it disposed of?' " In reply, he gives simply the extracts already published from Cotton Mather's Magnalia and Holmes's Annals, as being entirely satisfactory. He then proceeds: "Your first query is, 'When were the first Presbyterian Ministers introduced and settled within the bounds of the New England States—who were those Ministers, and where located?' Among the first Presbyterian Ministers who came to New England, perhaps the first of all, was the Rev. John Moorhead, of Boston, who was born in Ireland in 1703, and received his education at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland. He arrived at Boston about the year 1727, in company with a number of Presbyterian families

from the north of Ireland, whose ancestors had emigrated to that country from Scotland, and who, from that circumstance, were denominated Scotch Irish. About the same time other ministers and people came from Ireland, and planted themselves in several parts of New England. Mr. Robert Abercrombie, with a number of families, settled at Pelham, Hampshire county, Massachusetts. Some years before this, Mr. James McGregore, with a considerable congregation, commenced the settlement of Londonderry, New Hampshire. I am not furnished with facts or documents which enable me to give a more particular and ample reply to this inquiry."

"Query 3d. Were there not some individual ministers and churches who used this form of government, but stood connected with none others at certain periods? If so, who and where were they?"

"Answer. Here, too, my reply must be very general. That there were Presbyterian ministers and churches remaining for years unconnected with any Presbytery, is evident from what has already been stated, if it be compared with the answer to the fifth query. Indeed, the first Presbyterian church in Newburyport, of which I was formerly Pastor, was formed without the aid of any Presbytery, and continued for several years unconnected with any."

"Query 4th. Were there not some churches in or about Boston, or elsewhere, which used a kind of mixed government, having both Ruling Elders and Deacons? If so, how long did this last, and how and when laid aside?"

"Answer. As to Boston, I know but of one Presbyterian church which has existed there, and that, I believe, during its existence was purely and strictly Presbyterian. It has long since become extinct. I recollect, indeed, at this moment, that about eleven or twelve years since there was an attempt to establish a Presbyterian church there; but the attempt was nearly abortive, and the church, after having maintained a sort of dying life for a very few years, expired. As to the Presbyterian churches at large, in former days, of New England, I am inclined to think that, so long as they retained the *name*, they generally preserved the *forms* of Presbyterianism. When those *forms* were given up, they professedly went over to Congregationalism. It is true that the church in Newburyport, of which I have spoken, commenced on the plan of choosing its Elders annually. It was received under the care of the Presbytery with the understanding that it should retain this peculiarity, and it has retained it to this day."

"Query 5th. When were Presbyteries, or associations of Presbyterian Ministers, first formed within those bounds? How many such were there, and what became of them, or what is their present situation?"

"Answer. The first Presbytery in New England was constituted in Londonderry, New Hampshire, April 16th, 1745, by the Rev. John Moorhead

of Boston, the Rev. David McGregore of Londonderry, and the Rev. Robert Abercrombie of Pelham, with an Elder from each of their respective churches. After three years, was added the church of Newburyport, whose Pastor was the Rev. Jonathan Parsons. The Presbytery, either at the time of its formation or some years afterwards, took the appellation of the Boston Presbytery. Its numbers increased gradually, but not rapidly, until the year 1770. It embraced twelve Ministers and as many Congregations. The plan now began to be seriously contemplated of forming a Synod, and, as in several subsequent years additions continued to be made, this plan was carried into effect at a meeting held at Saybrook, New Hampshire, May 31, 1775. The distribution of Ministers and Churches was as follows: Mr. Parsons of Newburyport, Doctor Whitaker of Salem, Mr. Puley of Saybrook, Mr. McLean of Bristol, (Maine,) and the congregation in Boston, of which Mr. Moorhead had been the Pastor, together with Mr. Balch, and the vacancies within their bounds, were formed into the Presbytery of Salem. Mr. McGregore of Londonderry, Mr. Mitchell of Pembroke, Mr. Williams of Windham, Mr. Strickland of Oakham, with the congregations of Peterborough, and other vacancies appertaining, were constituted the Presbytery of Londonderry. Mr. Heuston of Bedford, and Mr. Baldwin of Kingston, with the vacant congregations of Blandford, Pelham, and Colraine, and Messrs. Hutchinson, Merritt, Gilmore, and Patrick, were constituted the Presbytery of Palmer. The three Presbyteries, thus organized, were formed into the Synod of New England, which held its first meeting at Londonderry September 4th, 1775. It continued to hold its meetings, usually at the same place, for four or five years."

"Some years previous to this, another Presbytery was formed, under circumstances somewhat peculiar, by Mr. Murray, once a Minister in Philadelphia, but now settled at Booth bay, in Maine, in connexion with a few other Ministers. But this Presbytery never connected itself with the Synod of New England; it was styled the Presbytery of the Eastward.

"Nor did the experiment of a Synod issue as favorably as had been anticipated. It was attended with few accessions to the Presbyterian cause. For this various reasons might be assigned: The wide dispersion of the Ministers and Churches did not favor their comfortable and frequent communion; the great mass of New England people were strongly attached to the principles of Congregationalism, and of course little disposed to a change. In addition to this, the churches and sections of churches which sought the new connexion were frequently influenced by a wish to avoid the pecuniary support of Congregational Ministers, rather than a genuine attachment to the Presbyterian cause; nor can it be denied, that the Ministers who applied to Presbyteries for reception, and were received with lit-

its scrutiny, were sometimes men of doubtful or tarnished characters. In a few years only from its formation, serious difficulties and divisions arose in the Synod itself; and, its members being materially reduced, it was agreed it should be dissolved, and its members formed into a single Presbytery, styled the Presbytery of Salem; this took place in the year 1782. The new Presbytery soon languished, and, after having met in a few instances in Massachusetts proper, transferred its meetings to Maine, which was the residence of most of the Ministers and churches. The Ministers were, for various causes, ere long dismissed, and the churches either became extinct or assumed the Congregational form.

"About the year 1789 negotiations were commenced between the Presbytery of the Eastward and the Associate Presbytery of New York, having for their object the union of the two bodies. After various difficulties and delays, the object was accomplished in October, 1793, and the newly formed body took the name of the Presbytery of Londonderry. This Presbytery, in the year 1809, formed a regular connexion with the Synod of Albany. For several years, both before and after this event, it flourished and increased. In the year 1826 it applied to the Synod for a division, and, in consequence, the Synod detached the portion of the Presbytery belonging to Massachusetts, consisting of twelve Ministers and five churches, and formed them into the Presbytery of Newburyport.

"The Presbytery of Londonderry is still in a flourishing state; most of its churches were Presbyterian in their origin, and retain, *in good measure*, their early principles and habits. It is otherwise with the Presbytery of Newburyport; most of the few churches which compose it were originally Congregational, and, as they adopted Presbyterianism under the *influence of circumstances*, they have been reduced by *circumstances* to revert to their original form. The only church now remaining is in Newburyport."

"Query 6th. Were there not such Presbyteries, or Associations, as were of a mixed character, part of whose Ministers were Presbyterian and part Congregational—and did not their government and mode of transacting business sometimes partake of a mixed character?"

"Answer. In the Presbyteries of Londonderry and Newburyport, we have been in the habit of receiving Congregational Ministers who have wished to join us. But these brethren have brought nothing of their Congregationalism into the Presbytery; they govern their respective churches upon Congregational principles, but in all the transactions of our Presbyterial meetings they are as good Presbyterians as any of us. So, likewise, those of us who were Presbyterians from the first, when called by Congregational churches to make part of their councils for ordination, or for other purposes, quietly proceed upon Congregational principles."

"Last query. What books or documents can be had to throw light on this subject?"

"Answer. Here, I confess, my mind is much uninformed; I have met with almost nothing of the kind in print. The meager information I have given you has been chiefly collected from my own memory and from Presbyterial records, most of which are now in the hands of the Rev. Mr. Perry. The only volume from which I have drawn is the Ecclesiastical History of Maine, written by the Rev. Jonathan Greenleaf, now Secretary to the American Seamen's Friend Society, residing in New York."

Such was the information from my estimable old friend, Dr. Dana, one of the most aged and respectable clergymen in Massachusetts, and a consistent Presbyterian. Information from a more competent and correct source cannot be found. Whether it corroborates or refutes the statements, given by the Princeton Professor, respecting the number of genuine Presbyterians among the first settlers of New England, the prevalence of these principles there, and the influence they had in fixing the church polity of the Congregationalists of those States, I shall now leave to him and others to determine.

Before, however, I pass from the Puritan Fathers of New England, I must notice what Professor Hodge says about their colonizing or forming settlements out of the bounds of New England. Good and excellent as our Professor represents these venerable men and their system of church polity to be, for reasons best known to himself, he all at once becomes very fearful lest some of the venerable Puritans should be found in the regions round about where the first Presbyterian churches were formed, and that it should be thought they had some hand in forming those churches, or in giving a caste to the kind of government which they adopted. We shall now, as he has laid so much stress upon it, look into this matter a little, to see whether his statements are more correct upon this subject than those we have heretofore examined. I shall make extracts from Professor Hodge, pages 41, 42, 43, and 44.

"Smith, in his history of New York, in 1756, gives the following account of the inhabitants of Long Island at that period: In King's county, opposite New York, the inhabitants are all Dutch. In Queen's county they are divided into Dutch and English Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Quakers. Suffolk county, except one small Episcopal congregation, consists entirely of English Presbyterians." Professor Hodge, in a note, here says: "Smith probably used the word *Presbyterian in a wide sense.*"

Query 1. Did he use it more loosely or widely than Professor Hodge has used it in many other places? Query 2. Why was he afraid to let Smith's statement stand as he wrote it? Was he afraid it would injure his

cause, as it was so easy of refutation? Why then quote him at all, if he knew it was not to his purpose, or was not strictly correct? Query 3. Does it not seem, from this note, as if conclusive arguments to establish his position were scarce with Professor Hodge, and that he was willing or forced to put up with supplemental shifts the best he could?

To avoid being tedious, I shall quote from our Professor the substance of his remarks, without being literal, referring to the page, and pledging myself not intentionally to misrepresent him. Page 42, he says: "Newark, in East Jersey, was settled, in 1667 or 1668, by about thirty families, principally from Brandford, in Connecticut." "As," says he, "the New England Puritans were some of them Congregationalists and some Presbyterians, *it is not easy to ascertain to which class the emigrants to East Jersey belonged.*" After saying it was probable some preferred one form and some another, he adds, without any doubt, "*Those who settled at Newark were Presbyterians.*"

To show upon what kind of foundation Professor Hodge is willing sometimes to rest his statements and arguments, I shall give a quotation now literally. Page 42: "The Rev. Abraham Pierson was, *it is believed*, [here is the evidence, *it is believed*—by whom besides himself, or on what evidence, we are not told, but it is believed,] *episcopally ordained* in England, from whence he emigrated to this country with a number of followers. After several previous attempts at settlement, they fixed themselves at Brandford, in Connecticut. Being dissatisfied, however, with the union between the colonies of New Haven and Connecticut, they removed to Newark; after continuing the Pastor of the church there for about twenty years, Mr. Pierson was succeeded by his son, who was subsequently appointed the first President of Yale College. These two Ministers, *tradition relates*, [here is his proof,] were *moderate Presbyterians*, but the son more *especially*." [More especially what? Why more especially a moderate Presbyterian? What distinction can be drawn between a moderate Presbyterian and a more moderate Presbyterian? This must be a nice distinction indeed.] "He [that is the son] had imbibed moderate Presbyterianism from his father, and when at Cambridge College he had received strong prejudices against Plymouthean Independency, and after his father's death he was for introducing more rigid Presbyterianism into Newark. It appears, from the narrative just quoted, that this attempt of the younger Pierson was sustained by some Scotch members of the congregation, and opposed by others more recently from Connecticut, who were in favor of the Saybrook Platform." "It is probable that this difficulty led to Mr. Pierson's removal. In 1715 the church of Newark appears in connexion with the Presbytery of Philadelphia."

I shall comment a little upon this strange paragraph. 1. If Mr. Pierson, the elder, had been a Presbyterian, ought not the Professor to have given us some better evidence of it than "*it is believed*," and "*tradition relates?*" If he had no better evidence than this, he ought not to have asserted that either the elder or the younger Pierson was a Presbyterian at all; and if he had better authority, he was bound to produce it.

2. What can be meant by their being moderate Presbyterians? Does Professor Hodge admit of such a distinction as moderate and strict Presbyterians? Then how does this comport with what he says, pages 14 and 15: "It is difficult to know what is meant when it is said, 'The Presbyterian systems of the French Huguenots and of South Britain were much more mild than those of Holland and Scotland.'" This quotation he takes from Doctor Hill's sketches, No. 7, as he says; and he complains of the want of comprehension to understand its meaning. He goes further in quoting from said sketches: "It is said that we adopted a system more allied to the mild form of Presbyterianism prevalent among some of the Reform churches than to that of Scotland." This he pronounces "a great mistake," &c. He certainly admits this distinction when he says the Pierson's were moderate Presbyterians, if his "*tradition*" meant any thing.

3. But he seems to think that the younger Pierson, after leaving his father, from *whom he had imbibed moderate Presbyterianism*, and going to Cambridge, became higher toned in his Presbyterianism from disgust at the Independency of Plymouth; and, with the help of some Scotch members, wished to introduce a more rigid system of Presbyterianism into the church at Newark. This looks very much like admitting that moderate Presbyterianism was opposed to the Scotch rigid system, which distinction has so much offended the Professor heretofore. Again: The Scotch members were opposed, in their attempt to introduce the more rigid system, by members who had come from Connecticut, and who were in favor of the Saybrook Platform, which had been pronounced more Presbyterian than Congregational. But what is to be made of this: "As the New England Puritans were some of them Congregationalists and some Presbyterians, it is not easy to ascertain to which class the emigrants to East Jersey belonged." More contradictions, in so short a compass, cannot easily be found.

4. Is it supposable that the younger Pierson, who had become so pleased with rigid Scotch Presbyterians, and so opposed to the friends of the Saybrook Platform as to have to resign his congregation on that account, would have been chosen by the Trustees of Yale College, chiefly composed of Connecticut clergymen, as President of their College? The Puritans did not often betray such folly.

5. The year after the younger Pierson had to leave Newark on account

of his rigid Presbyterianism, another Pierson—a younger brother, *and the maternal grandfather of the venerable Doctor Green*—was chosen Pastor of Woodbridge, near Newark, the inhabitants of which town also were composed of Scotch and New Englanders, according to Professor Hodge. This Mr. Pierson governed the congregation of Woodbridge for forty years; during which time there was no session, as he managed the affairs of the congregation without Elders. See note at the bottom of page 38. The Piersons must have degenerated in our Professor's estimation.

6. To prove that Newark was settled and governed by Presbyterians, Professor Hodge refers to a manuscript history, and asserts that its writer says, "that an aged Elder, then eighty-six years old, stated that there had been a church session at Newark from the earliest time he could remember, and that he always *understood* there was one from the beginning." Does our Professor expect to establish *historical facts* by such vague hearsay stories as this? Then he may prove any thing.

To avoid too great prolixity, it will be necessary to pass over a number of other statements of the same kind, which could be as easily shown to be misrepresentations of historical facts, or a violent wresting of them from their plain and obvious meaning, to make them testify in support of a favorite hypothesis. But, after these few samples of our Professor's ingenuity, (to say nothing of his candor,) the reader will be left to form his own opinion respecting the degree of credit that ought to be given to his statements.

There is another subject of rather more importance, and which will have a more direct bearing upon the formation and character of American Presbyterianism, which we must not pass over so lightly. The subject now alluded to is, the kind of people, their habits, education, and opinions relative to religion, who founded the settlements in which the first Presbyterian churches were formed, and from which the Mother Presbytery was formed.

The reader will be first served with a quotation or two from Professor Hodge upon this subject. In page 43 he says: "The Puritans were not very successful in their attempts to form settlements upon the Delaware. In 1640 the colony of New Haven made a large purchase on both sides of that river, and sent out about fifty families to make a settlement. As this country was, however, covered by a previous claim of the Dutch, the trading establishment of the New Haven colony was broken up by the Hollanders, and the people scattered."

The natural inference to be drawn from this statement would be, that this attempt of New Haven to colonize upon the Delaware proved a failure, and was abandoned. We shall, however, hear more of this settlement presently.

Again, page 44, he says: "In 1669 application was made by New Haven to the Commissioners of the United Colonies to make plantations on the Delaware, but the proposal was declined, and it was left to the New Haven merchants to dispose of the land which they had purchased, or to plant it, as they should see cause. *Some permanent settlements, however, at a subsequent period,* were made upon the Jersey side of the Delaware. Fairfield, for example, was settled about 1690, by a number of persons from a town of the same name in Connecticut. This fact is ascertained by the law creating the township of Fairfield, passed in 1697. Cape May was also a Puritan settlement, of which their records contain indubitable evidence."

Before I notice other inaccuracies in this statement, I will at once correct one which may be thought a trivial one, but it has a bearing as it stands. It might have been a typographical error, or a *lapsis pennæ*, but even errors of this kind seem to be all on one side. It is stated by Professor Hodge that the application made by the New Haven merchants to the United Colonies of New England, to assist them in forming their settlement upon the Delaware, occurred in 1669, whereas it took place in 1649, just twenty years before, and only nine years after the enterprise was undertaken, and after Professor Hodge would lead his readers to believe it was abandoned altogether.

It may be proper here to inform the reader why so much importance seems to be attached to the settlements which were formed upon the Delaware, and the parts adjacent. Of the seven Ministers who first formed the Mother Presbytery, in 1704 or 1705, they were all located, with their respective congregations, upon the river Delaware—from Philadelphia, the most northerly, to the mouth of the river, and down the peninsula in what is now the State of Delaware, together with the eastern shore of Maryland and Virginia, and all on the western side of the Delaware, except perhaps one on the east side of that river. The original inhabitants of this region, at this time, were in some measure homogeneous, though their original elements were various. The population of those parts was a mixture of Swedes, Hollanders, New Englanders, French, and English, in various proportions, who, after many contentions, were now united in peace, and speedily blending one with another to form the new American character. If, therefore, we can form any just idea of the constituent parts of this compound, and in their just proportions, we shall be able to ascertain with some precision what the amalgamation or compound would be. There might have been at this time, here and there, a Scotch adventurer among them, but there is no evidence existing that a colony or company of Scotchmen had ever yet settled in these bounds. There were a number of

Scotch settlers located in East Jersey and New York, but none further west and south, at this early period, that are known of.

A few years after the formation of the Mother Presbytery, additions were made to their numbers from East Jersey, and Long Island, in New York, and one Welchman from a settlement lately formed from Wales in the interior of Pennsylvania. From 1715 to 1719, a number of Irish settlers located themselves in New England, about Londonderry, and in Carolina; but as yet we read of none to any amount, from that nation, who settled on the Delaware or in Pennsylvania. But soon after this time the Scotch Irish, from the north of Ireland, and many Scotch servants, or Scotchmen of the lower class, began to crowd over to Pennsylvania, and thence further south, in vast numbers I have said nothing about the Germans who emigrated in large bodies to Pennsylvania, New York, and elsewhere about the same time, as they were so clannish as to keep very much to themselves, and seldom united in those days with any other society but their own, and those who spoke the German language.

The first settlement formed upon the Delaware was by a company of Swedes and Fins, of which Smith's New Jersey and Holmes's Annals give this account: "William Usselin, an eminent Swedish merchant, having greatly extolled the country in the neighborhood of New Netherlands, (i. e. New York,) Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, issued a proclamation exhorting his subjects to contribute to a company associated for the settlement of a colony in that territory. Considerable sums were raised by contribution, and a number of Swedes and Fins came over this year to America. They first landed at Cape Henlopen, (the southern cape of the Delaware,) the sight of which gave them such pleasure that they called it Paradise Point. Some time after, they bought of the natives the land from that Cape to the falls of Delaware, (above Trenton,) and obtained peaceable possession."* This took place between 1627 and 1629.

In the year 1638, ten years afterwards, "A company of Swedes, under the direction of Minuitz, erected habitations on the eastern banks of the river Delaware. Kieft, Governor of New Netherlands, remonstrated against this, claiming the property as belonging to the Dutch, but the Swedes retained possession."† Hitherto no other Christian people had formed any settlements on or near the river Delaware.

In the year 1640, "A large tract of land was purchased by Connecticut of the Indians, including about half of Long Island, embracing the north and west coasts; and another large purchase was made by Captain Turner,

* See Smith's New Jersey, page 22, and Holmes's Annals, vol. 1, page 192.
† Holmes's Annals, vol. 1, page 250.

agent for New Haven, on both sides of the Delaware river and bay." This purchase was made with a view to trade, *and for the settlement of churches in Gospel order and purity.* The colony erected trading-houses upon the lands, and sent about fifty families to make settlements upon them.

This occurrence entirely escaped Professor Hodge, who fixes the first attempt to settle upon the Delaware in the year 1669, and made even that to be a failure. But this was not all. This same year, 1640, the New Haven colony purchased additional lands on Long Island, and formed a settlement at Southhold. A congregation, or church, was organized under a Mr. John Youngs, a Minister from England, who, with many of his former charge, had settled here, and united themselves in ecclesiastical connexion with the people of New Haven.*

This was the beginning of the settlement at Southhold, on Long Island, and of its church connexion. We can now give Professor Hodge some additional information respecting his moderate Presbyterian Minister, the Rev. Abraham Pierson, the elder.

"Several inhabitants of Lynn, Massachusetts, finding themselves straitened for land, went to Long Island in search of a plantation, and agreed with Lord Stirling's agent there for a tract of land near the west end of the island, and with the natives for their right. The Dutch at New Netherlands, hearing of these contracts, sent men to take possession of the place and to set up the arms of the Prince of Orange. Ten or twelve of the English company soon after began to erect buildings, and took down the Prince's arms, in the place of which an Indian drew an ugly face. Provoked at this, the Dutch sent soldiers, who brought off the Englishmen, imprisoned them, and, after a few days, having taken an oath from them, they set them at liberty. The adventurers now moved to the east end of the island, where, to the number of forty families, they settled the town of Southampton, inviting Mr. Pierson, a man of learning and piety, to be their Minister. He and several of the company formed themselves into a church at Lynn before their departure, and the whole company, with the advice of some of the magistrates of Massachusetts, erected themselves into a civil government."†

But here is another piece of information for our Professor, and that is,

* See Trumbull, vol. 1, book 1, chap. 7: also Holmes's Annals, vol. 1, pages 259, 260.

† Holmes's Annals, vol. 1, page 257; but especially Mather's Magnalia, book 3, chapter 8. If our learned Professor of Princeton had noticed this chapter of Mather's Magnalia, he would not have gone to guessing that Mr. Pierson had been episcopally ordained in England; he would have found that his ecclesiastical standing was assumed at Boston, and that he was as thorough-going a Congregationalist as any there at that day. But he can manufacture Presbyterians when and how he pleases, and unmake them as fast.

that as early as 1640 a large body of land was purchased by the inhabitants of New Haven, on both sides of the river Delaware, for the express purpose "*of forming the settlement of churches in Gospel order and purity*," and a colony of fifty families was commenced there at that early period for that very purpose.

Professor Hodge, page 45, seems unwilling to allow that the Puritans could make any impression upon Virginia at that early period. He indeed admits there were a few Puritan families in that colony from the beginning, and a few scattering settlers from Massachusetts; but, except the small congregation which had lately been gathered in 1642, and which was finally broken up in 1648, the impression made by the Puritans in Virginia was, according to his account, very trifling, and scarcely worth a notice.

It is true, the spirit of bigotry, intolerance, and persecution, which prevailed in the colony of Virginia, was well calculated to deter and drive away from her borders all but high-toned Episcopalians of the Laudean stamp. But there is no doubt that many of the Puritanic caste came out as servants and laborers, who had to submit and conform, whatever their private sentiments might have been. In the year 1621 a gentleman of some note came over, with a number of servants and laborers in his train, and, among the rest, eighty Irish settlers. Who these Irish were we are not told; but as Catholics were forbidden to enter the territory, we know they were not of that class. They were not likely to be Episcopalians, for that denomination were rarely found in Ireland in that day among the lower class of society. The probability is, they were Scotch Irish Presbyterians, as far as they had any religious preferences. Where *Master Gookins*, as he is called, located his plantation, we are not told; it is probable that it was upon some outskirt of the then settlement, where they would be less likely to attract notice, or meet with disturbance, from the want of conformity in the established worship, if they were of the dissenting party. That they were so is highly probable, as many of them, and Gookins their leader at their head, were among the converts and followers of the Puritan Ministers who were sent to Virginia in the year 1642, at the earnest solicitation of Messengers who had been sent to Boston for Ministers to supply them in their great destitution. Although these Missionaries that were sent from New England were not allowed to remain in Virginia more than a short time, nor to preach in any of their churches, yet their pious labors were crowned with abundant success, and the church they got together and organized could not be entirely suppressed for a number of years; and when they were forced to fly, their great patron Gookins, with the greater part of the private members, fled to Massachusetts, where they united themselves in peace and quiet among kindred spirits. Gookins became a very prominent

man both in church and state, and exerted a powerful influence, especially as the fellow-laborer of Elliot, the great apostle among the Indians.

The influence these exiles exerted among their former friends and neighbors in Virginia was no doubt felt as long as any of them lived; and there is reason to believe that they had not become extinct when the memorable Makemie arrived, toward the close of the seventeenth century. It was upon the foundation thus laid, no doubt, that his great success was based in introducing Presbyterianism both in Virginia and in other British colonies of North America. We shall hear more hereafter about the labors of this apostle of Presbyterianism in America, and the ready entrance he met with from the people in Virginia, where had it not been for the bigoted and persecuting rulers of that province, a riper harvest seldom ever presented itself.

The year 1642 was a time of persecution to the Puritans, not only in Virginia, but in their new settlement on the Delaware and on Long Island. Holmes's Annals, page 267: "The people of New Haven, intending to make a plantation on the Delaware, had sent agents who duly purchased of the natives several tracts of land, to which neither the Swedes nor the Dutch had any just title; and had erected a trading-house, and a plantation had begun the year before, and twenty families had been transported thither. This infant settlement, as well as the Swedes their neighbors, had the summer before suffered so severely by sickness as threatened the very existence of this new colony; and, to mend the matter, Kieft, the Dutch Governor of New Netherlands, without any protest or legal warning, sent armed men to Delaware, who burned the trading-house and seized their goods."

The Swedes were the first settlers upon the Delaware, and the New-Englanders were the next. Neither had any just title to their lands, further than occupation and purchase from the native Indians. The Hollanders had no settlement of any kind as yet, not even a trading-house, upon or near the river Delaware, though they claimed all the territory, from the Delaware to the Connecticut river, by right of discovery, as they pretended; but even that was without foundation, nor had they purchased a foot of land from the natives. But all these discouragements did not deter the Puritans from prosecuting their enterprise, and keeping possession of the lands they had purchased upon the Delaware, as we shall hear in the sequel.

The same year, 1642, "Emigrants from Maryland having taken possession of the Schuylkill near its entrance into the Delaware, the Governor of New Netherlands, hearing of what he deemed an intrusion, sent Alpendam from Manhattan with two sloops, and easily dispossessed these English colonists; who were unprepared for resistance. The weakness of Maryland, yet in its infancy, and the civil distractions of the parent country, involved

in civil war, prevented expressions of provincial and of national resentment."*

In the year 1643, Holmes, in his Annals, makes this entry: "The English New Haven colonists, in all their attempts to settle a plantation on the Delaware, found the Swedes open enemies, and the Dutch secret underminers of their interest. This year Mr. Lamberton, in their name, complained to the Commissioners of the United Colonies of New England of many gross injuries which they had sustained from both; of the Dutch for burning down their trading-house on the river, and of the Swedes for disturbing their agents. Governor Winthrop, of Massachusetts, President of the Commissioners of the United Colonies, wrote in September to William Kieft, the Dutch Governor of New Netherlands, and to John Printz, the Swedish Governor on the Delaware, on the subject of these injuries, and soon after received answers, but without satisfaction. The Commissioners, however, authorized Mr. Lamberton to treat with the Swedish Governor, and gave him a new commission to proceed with the trade and plantation on the Delaware, and harmony was restored."

Hitherto the plantation and settlement of lands upon the Delaware were undertaken under the authority and responsibility of a company of merchants from New Haven, but now this colony was taken under the protection of the United Colonies of New England.

In the year 1649, "A proposal was made to the Commissioners of the United Colonies, by the General Court of New Haven, to assist in the speedily planting the lands on the Delaware; which proposition was for the present declined, in consideration of the present state of the colonies, as generally destitute of sufficient hands to carry on their necessary occupations. But the New Haven merchants were left to their own resources to carry on the enterprise as they were able, declaring, however, that none should molest them nor interfere with their rights upon that river."

In 1651, "The Dutch erected a trading-house, or rather a fortification, on a low point of land near where Newcastle now stands, which commanded the river Delaware. Hudde, who was left to rule and traffic there, purchased of the Minquaas Indians the lands on the western shore of the Delaware, from Christina creek to the river Brompthook, which was the earliest settlement and purchase made there by the Dutch. The Swedes, observing this conduct of their rivals, protested against it with little effect; but the Swedish Governor rising, took the place by force the next year, and named it Fort Casimir. Having strengthened and enlarged that fort, he soon after erected Fort Christina, a few miles higher up the river."

* See Chalmers, book 1, chap. 21, page 632.

A succinct account shall now be given of what was done in forming the settlements on either side of the Delaware, and down in the peninsula, including the eastern shore of Maryland and Virginia, so as to give an idea of the population in those regions with respect to religion, without formal quotations, and reference may be had to Holmes's Annals, under the respective dates, for the correctness of this summary statement.

In the year 1655 the Dutch felt very sensibly the blow given them in the year 1651, just mentioned, and, without being able to redress their grievances themselves, they applied to Holland, their mother country, for assistance. An armed force, of six or seven hundred men and seven ships of war, was put under their Governor, Stuyvesant, who sailed up the Delaware, and compelled the Swedes to surrender their forts on articles of capitulation. After their houses and property had been chiefly destroyed, their officers and principal inhabitants were sent home to Gottenburg.

The Dutch now became masters of the territory which had been held by the Swedes. Thirty of the Swedes took the oath of fidelity to the States General and remained in the country, and were allowed the enjoyment of their own religion.

The Rev. Dr. Collin, an aged and highly respected Minister of a Swedish church near Philadelphia, in 1823 gave the following answer to questions which were put to him:

"The Swedes, on their first arrival, proceeded up the west of Delaware near Wilmington, and built a fort on a small river that falls into the Delaware, naming both the fort and river after their reigning Queen, Christina, which name the river still retains. The Hollanders established themselves on the North river, (now called the Hudson,) and claimed all the territory on the Delaware, and beyond it, though they had only a small and scattered settlement on the eastern shore, but none on the western shore of that river. They protested against the Swedes, and finally conquered the population, which as yet was very weak, in 1665, by a very superior force. Sweden, then engaged in war with six Powers, could not relieve it, but did not make a cession."

The Hollanders in this expedition appear not to have interfered with the New England settlement directly, as they had no military forts, and had never been engaged in war with the Dutch. So they were left in the undisturbed enjoyment of what possessions they had.

In the year 1658, three years after the Dutch had subdued this settlement, Stuyvesant, Governor of New Netherlands, gave orders to purchase of the Indians the lands around Cape Henlopen, in order to raise a fortification and extend settlements; although the New Haven company, as far back as 1640, had purchased the same on both sides of the bay and river,

and had built trading-houses and commenced settlements upon this very territory.

In 1659, a serious dispute arose between the Dutch settlements, which were just forming around Cape Henlopen, upon the bay of Delaware, and Lord Baltimore, proprietary of Maryland, about the right of territory. Lord Baltimore claimed all lands lying between the Potomac and Delaware bay and river. The Dutch, who had seated themselves on the Delaware bay within his Lordship's province, were commanded to be gone. But Col. Uric, the agent for Maryland, was authorized to inform them that, if they should wish to remain where they were, and were willing to live peaceably and come under his Lordship's government, they should find good and easy conditions—such as were granted to all other settlers under that wise and liberal charter. The province of Maryland the next year, within all its bounds, from the Potomac to the Delaware, included but about twelve thousand inhabitants of every description.

In 1662, by order of the Governor of Maryland, the Dutch who had settled around Cape Henlopen were ordered off, and the territory immediately occupied by other settlers.

In 1663, a ship arrived from Holland with planters and implements of husbandry, to settle on the Delaware, but they were obliged either to depart or submit to be governed by the authority of Maryland.

In 1664, the New Netherlands, or Dutch settlements in New York, were, by an armed force, taken from Holland and brought under British government. The Duke of York was made proprietary of the province by his brother, Charles II. The Swede and Dutch settlers upon the river and bay of Delaware, who had never before professed allegiance or acknowledged subjection to the British government, in connexion with the English settlers in the same territory, all now acknowledged subjection to Maryland, and thus came under British authority.*

In 1677, Burlington, east of Delaware, was settled by a colony of Quakers chiefly.

In 1681, a charter was granted to William Penn for all the territory which lay between the river and bay of Delaware and Lord Baltimore's province of Maryland. But the bounds of the territories heretofore granted being very loosely laid, both the Duke of York and Lord Baltimore claimed the settlements which had been made on the west side of the river Delaware

* The English inhabitants of Maryland, in the year 1665, amounted to 16,000. This rapid progress in population is ascribed to the liberal policy of Lord Baltimore from the beginning; for, at the first settlement of Maryland, liberty was given, by law, to all denominations of Christians to settle in that province.

and its mouth, which were called the three lower counties. This territory was now granted to William Penn, and was relinquished by the other claimants, and was called the Territories of Pennsylvania. This is the tract of country now forming the State of Delaware. William Penn published a very liberal frame of government, allowing full liberty of conscience to all, without respect to sect, and offering very liberal terms to settlers; which caused a great influx of colonists to Pennsylvania, as had been the case in Maryland before from the same liberal policy.

Smith, in his History of New Jersey, says, in 1684, "The people in East Jersey, being mostly from New England, do most incline that way. Newark appears to have been the only town in that province which had a settled preacher who followed no other employment." By this is understood, "who was supported by the people." If there were other preachers, they had to make the means of support in some other way.

In 1696, a settlement had before this day been made by New Englanders on Ashly river, in Carolina. These, this year, received a great accession to their strength from Massachusetts. A church was organized at Dorchester, which, with their Minister, Mr. Joseph Lord, emigrated to join their countrymen upon Ashly river; and in February, 1696, the Lord's Supper was administered for the first time in this colony, as Mr. L. was the first Minister of the Gospel who settled in these bounds. This is the origination of the settlement, called Dorchester to this day, about eighteen miles from Charleston.

This same year, the Swedes upon the Delaware sent an humble petition to Charles XII, King of Sweden, making known their destitute situation from the want of Ministers and the means of Grace. The King, therefore, sent them over a supply of Ministers and religious books.

In 1700, the Swedes and Dutch, settled on the Delaware, in Pennsylvania, had each of them some Minister of their own settled among them; but the English had none until this year, when the Rev. Mr. Evans, an Episcopal Minister, was sent over to them by Compton, Bishop of London, who settled in Philadelphia, and commenced worship there in that form. This same year the Episcopal Church of England was established in Maryland. The number of Ministers in New England at this time was one hundred and twenty.*

* Let it be recollected that up to this time (i. e. 1700) there is neither written nor traditionary evidence that any dissenting Minister was settled south of New Netherlands, or New York, except one in Newark, New Jersey, Mr. Pierson; one in Philadelphia, Mr. Andrews; and one in Accomack, Virginia, Mr. Makemie. There were itinerants, or missionaries, who occasionally visited and labored in East and West Jersey, and in Maryland, and the settlements on the bay and river of Delaware. These Missionaries

In 1701, the Society for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts was established in England by Episcopalians. It will be seen hereafter, that what led to this, probably, was the associating together of some Dissenters in and about London, to send Missionaries to the American Colonies.

In 1702, the Episcopal church was established in New Jersey by Lord Cornbury, in compliance with instructions from Queen Anne.

In 1703, the Ministers and Elders of the French Protestant church were allowed to build themselves a more commodious house of worship in New York.

It will be seen presently for what purpose this hasty sketch of the progress of those settlements, and of the kind of people forming them, is given. We are just arriving at the period when Presbyterianism was first introduced into America. We shall soon see who were the principal agents in bringing this about, and what kind of materials they had to work upon. Of the seven Ministers who formed at first the Mother Presbytery, four of them labored and settled upon the Delaware, and all their congregations lay upon that river between Philadelphia and Cape Henlopen; the remaining three were located on the eastern shore of Maryland, and Accomack county in Virginia, adjoining the eastern shore of Maryland. It has been seen how destitute this region of country had before been of Ministers and the ordinances of the Gospel. We may readily suppose, beforehand, from whence Ministers would be sought by a population composed of Swedes and Dutch, and New Englanders and Marylanders. The two first, using a language of their own, and connected with the church of the mother country, were supplied from Sweden and Holland. The New England part of the population, which was no doubt the most numerous upon the Delaware river, would of course look to be supplied from New England. Whence Maryland and Virginia got supplied remains now to be told.

Doctor F. L. Hawks, in his Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Episcopal Church in Maryland, vol. 2, pages 34, 35, makes these remarks, after giving an account of a law which passed the Legislature in 1646, respecting religious freedom, viz: "There doubtless were Roman Catholics in the Legislature to share the honor of this enactment, but our authority [i. e. Leah and Rachel, a tract written in 1656] informs us that divers others had removed into the colony, as every possible encouragement had been given to such removals by the Lord proprietor; and because there were some few Papists that first inhabited there themselves, and others being

were Puritans from New England. This was only four or five years before the first Presbytery was formed. We shall hear more of these travelling Puritan Missionaries hereafter.

"The brethren of the Presbyterian way in England are lately come into such a *happy Union* with those Congregational, that all former names of distinction are now swallowed up in that blessed one of *United Brethren*. And now, partly because one of New England, Mr. Increase Mather, then resident at London, was very singularly instrumental of effecting that Union," &c. The Union here alluded to is as follows:

"*Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers, formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational.*

"I. Of Churches and Church Members.

"1. We acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ to have one Catholic Church, or Kingdom, comprehending all that are united to him, whether in heaven or earth. And do conceive the whole multitude of visible believers, and their infant seed, (commonly called the Catholic Church,) to belong to Christ's spiritual kingdom in this world. But for the notion of a Catholic visible church here, as it signifies its having been collected into any one formed society, under a visible human head on earth, whether one person singly or many collectively, we, with the rest of Protestants, unanimously disclaim it.

"2. We agree that particular societies of visible Saints, who, under Christ their head, are statedly joined together for ordinary communion with one Author in all the ordinances of Christ, are to be owned by each other as instituted churches of Christ, though differing in *apprehensions* and *practice* in some lesser things.

"3. That none shall be admitted as members, in order to communion in all the special ordinances of the Gospel, but such persons as are knowing and sound in *the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion*, without scandal in their lives, and to a judgment regulated by the Word of God, are persons of visible holiness and honesty, credibly professing cordial subjection to Jesus Christ.

"4. A competent number of such visible Saints (as before described) are the capable subjects of stated communion in all the special ordinances of Christ, upon their mutual declared consent and agreement to walk together therein according to Gospel rule. In which declaration different degrees of *explicitness* shall no ways hinder such churches from owning each other as instituted churches.

"5. Though parochial bounds be not of Divine right, yet, for common edification, the members of a particular church ought (as much as conveniently may be) to live near one another.

"6. That each particular church hath right to use their own officers; and

being furnished with such as are duly qualified and ordained according to Gospel rule, hath authority from Christ for exercising government, and of enjoying all the ordinances of worship within itself.

"7. In the administration of church power it belongs to the Pastors and other Elders of every particular church, if such there be, to rule and govern, and to the *Brotherhood* to consent, according to the rule of the Gospel.

"8. That all professors, as before described, are bound in duty, as they have opportunity, to join themselves as fixed members of some particular church; their thus joining being part of their professed subjection to the Gospel of Christ, and an instituted means of their establishment and edification, whereby they are under the pastoral care; and, in case of scandalous and offensive walking, may be authoritatively admonished, or censured, for their recovery, and for vindication of the truth and the church professing it.

"9. That a visible professor, thus joined to a particular church, ought to continue steadfast to the said church, and not forsake the ministry and ordinances there dispensed without an orderly seeking a recommendation unto another church, which ought to be given when the case of the person apparently requires it.

"II. Of the Ministry.

"1. We agree that the Ministerial office is instituted by Jesus Christ for the gathering, guiding, edifying, and governing of his church, and to continue to the end of the world.

"2. That they who are called to this office be endued with competent learning and ministerial gifts, as also with the Grace of God; sound in judgment; not novices in the faith and knowledge of the Gospel; without scandal; of holy conversation; and such as devote themselves to the work and service thereof.

"3. That ordinarily none shall be ordained to the work of the Ministry but such as are called and chosen thereunto by a particular church.

"4. That in so great and weighty a matter as the calling and choosing a Pastor, we judge it ordinarily requisite that every such church consult and advise with the Pastors of neighboring congregations.

"5. That after such advice, the person consulted about being chosen by the Brotherhood of that particular church over which he is to be set, and he accepting, be duly ordained, and set apart to his office over them; wherein it is ordinarily requisite that the Pastors of neighboring congregations concur with the preaching Elder or Elders, if such there be.

"6. That, whereas such ordination is only intended for such as never

before had been ordained to the Ministerial office, if any judge that in the case also of the removal of one before ordained to a new station, or pastoral charge, there ought to be a like solemn recommending him and his labors to the grace and blessing of God, no different sentiments or practice herein shall be any occasion of contention or breach of communion among us.

"7. It is expedient that they who enter on the work of preaching the Gospel be not only qualified for communion of Saints, but also (except in cases extraordinary) that they give proof of their gifts and fitness for the said work unto the Pastors of churches, of known abilities to discern and judge of their qualifications, that they may be sent forth with solemn approbation and prayer; which we judge needful, that no doubt may remain concerning their being called unto the work, and for the preventing (as much as in us lieth) ignorant and rash intruders.

"III. Of Censures.

"1. As it cannot be avoided but that in the purest churches on earth there will sometimes offences and scandals arise, by reason of hypocrisy and prevailing corruption, so Christ hath made it the duty of every church to reform itself by spiritual remedies, appointed by him to be applied in all such cases, viz: admonition and excommunication.

"2. Admonition, being the rebuking of an offending member in order to conviction, is, in case of private offences, to be performed according to the rule in Matthew 18, 15, 17; and in case of public offences, openly before the church, as the honor of the Gospel and the nature of the scandal shall require. And if either of the admonitions take effect for the recovery of the fallen person, all further proceedings in a way of censure are therein to cease, and satisfaction to be declared accordingly.

"3. When all due means are used according to the order of the Gospel for the restoring an offending and scandalous brother, and he notwithstanding remains impenitent, the censure of excommunication is to be proceeded unto; wherein the Pastor and other Elders (if there be such) are to lead and go before the church, *and the Brotherhood to give consent*, in a way of obedience unto Christ, and to the Elders as over them in the Lord.

"4. It may sometimes come to pass that a church member, not otherwise scandalous, may sinfully withdraw and divide himself from the communion of the church to which he belongs. In which case, when all due means for the redeeming him prove ineffectual, he having thereby cut himself off from that church communion, the church may justly esteem and declare itself discharged of any further inspection over him.

"IV. Of Communion of Churches.

"1. We agree that particular churches ought not to walk so distinctly and separately from each other as not to have care and tenderness each one to another; but their Pastors ought to have frequent meetings together, that, by mutual advice, support, encouragement, and brotherly intercourse, they may strengthen the hearts and hands of each other in the ways of the Lord.

"2. That none of our particular churches shall be subordinate to one another, each being endued with equality of power from Jesus Christ. And that none of the said particular churches, their officer or officers, shall exercise any power or have any superiority over any other church or their officers.

"3. That known members of particular churches, constituted as aforesaid, may have occasional communion with one another in the ordinances of the Gospel, viz: the Word, Prayer, and Sacraments, singing of Psalms dispensed according to the mind of Christ; unless that church with which they desire communion hath any just exceptions against them.

"4. That we ought not to admit any one to be a member of our respective congregations that hath joined himself to another, without endeavors of mutual satisfaction of the congregation concerned.

"5. That one church ought not to blame the proceedings of another until it hath heard what the church charged, its Elders or Messengers, can say in vindication of themselves from any charge of irregular or injurious proceedings.

"6. That we are most willing and ready to give an account of our church proceedings to each other when desired, for preventing or removing any offences that may arise among us; likewise, we shall be ready to give the right hand of fellowship, and walk together according to the Gospel rules of communion of churches.

"V. Of Deacons and Ruling Elders.

"We agree that the office of Deacon is of Divine appointment, and that it belongs to that office to receive, lay out, and distribute the church's stock to its proper uses, by the direction of its Pastor and brethren if need be. And whereas divers are of opinion that there is also the office of *Ruling Elders* who labor not in word and doctrine, *and others think otherwise*, we agree that this difference make no breach among us.

"VI. Of occasional meeting of Ministers, &c.

"1. We agree that, in order to concord, and in other weighty and difficult cases, it is needful, and according to the mind of Christ, that the Ministers of several churches be consulted and advised with about such matters.

"2. That such meetings may consist of smaller or greater numbers, as the matter shall require.

"3. That particular churches, their respective Elders and Messengers, ought to have a reverential regard to their judgment so given, and not dissent therefrom *without apparent grounds from the Word of God.*

"VII. Of our demeanor to the Civil Magistrate.

"1. We do reckon ourselves obliged continually to pray for God's protection, guidance, and blessing upon the rulers set over us.

"2. That we ought to yield unto them not only subjection in the Lord, but support, according to our station and abilities.

"3. That if at any time it shall be their pleasure to call together any number of us, to require an account of our affairs, and the state of our congregations, we shall most readily express all dutiful regard to them herein.

"VIII. Of a Confession of Faith.

"As to what pertains to soundness of judgment in matters of faith, we esteem it sufficient that a church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God—the perfect and only rule of faith and practice; and own either the doctrinal part of those commonly called the Articles of the Church of England, or the Confession or Catechisms, shorter and larger, compiled by the Assembly at Westminster, or the Confession agreed on at the Savoy, to be agreeable to the said rule.

"IX. Of our duty and deportment towards them that are not in Communion with us.

"1. We may judge it our duty to bear a Christian respect to all Christians, according to their ranks and stations, that are not of our persuasion or communion.

"2. As for such as may be ignorant of the principles of the Christian religion, or of vicious conversation, we shall in our respective places, as they give opportunity, endeavor to explain to them the doctrine of Life and Salvation, and to our utmost persuade them to be reconciled to God.

"3. That to such as appear to have the *essential requisites to church communion*, we shall willingly *receive them in the Lord*, not *troubling them with disputes about lesser matters.*

"As we assent to the foregoing heads of agreement, so we unanimously resolve, as the Lord shall enable us, to practice according to them."

As considerable use will be made of this Plan of Union, as sustaining an intimate connexion with American Presbyterianism, and as giving it a character, I shall comment a little upon it now, while it is fresh in memory.

1. This plan is substantially the same with the Congregational Platforms of Cambridge and Saybrook, as Cotton Mather says they are; with which the Presbyterian Ministers could get along pretty well, without meeting with the difficulties they apprehended at first—and in which, Professor Hodge says, *all the elementary principles of Presbyterianism are found*; yea more, *that they are much more Presbyterian than Congregational, and, in some instances, more energetic than the Presbyterian system itself is.* But, if I can perceive any difference, the London Plan is more Congregational than either the Cambridge or Saybrook Platform, as a comparison would easily show. This arises from the fact, that the Congregationalism adopted in New England was much closer allied to the Presbyterian system than the Independent plan of England. Therefore, that which was professed as a compromise in England did not amount to what were the prevailing sentiments in New England, where there was no pretension to compromise at all; so that the Congregationalism of the Puritans of New England was, from the beginning, a very different thing from the Independency, or Congregationalism, of South Britain.

2. If the Presbyterianism of England was, in its day, as Professor Hodge says it was, *substantially the same as the strict Scotch system*, it must have been very short-lived, indeed, in so short a time to agree to merge into this London Plan of Union. The Bateses, and Mantans, and Howes, and Calamies, could now agree to drop the name of Presbyterian and assume that of United Brethren—a plan which Increase Mather, from New England, had so great a hand in forming. Their Presbyterianism must have been very superficial to have changed its character so soon. A true son of the kirk would never do so. If Professor Hodge can agree that this is genuine Presbyterianism, I can settle the difference between us in a very short time by agreeing, with him, that this shall give character to American Presbyterianism.

3. The use which will shortly be made of this, will be to show that it was from this London Union that the first Missionaries were sent to America, and that it was mostly under their patronage the Mother Presbytery was formed and commenced its operations. But we are not quite ready

for this at present. It will be necessary to show the difference between the manner in which Presbyterianism was introduced into Scotland and in which it commenced in America, and that the respective features of their systems arose, in a great measure, and assumed their character, from the necessity of the case. Each of these systems was the creature of circumstances, and could not well, at the time, have been different from what they were.

Without going much into detail, let it be remembered that, in the year 1555, that resolute, pious, and devoted, but at the same time rough, uncompromising, and rude man, John Knox, returned from Geneva, and began to introduce the reformation into Scotland. The greater part of the nobility, disgusted and oppressed by the insolence and impiety of the Romish Priests and dignitaries of that hierarchy, and anxious to get their great wealth into their possession, were ready instruments for Knox to work upon. There were a few, and but very few, of the clergy of Scotland ready to aid Knox in his adventurous enterprise; whatever were their private sentiments, they had not yet the manly daring to face the storm. Buchanan's History of Scotland, chapter 15, gives an account of these transactions. This great man was an eye-witness of these things, and bore a part both in the labors and sufferings which attended them. Referring to the high-handed and tyrannical conduct of the Romish Priests, this historian says: "While these things were acting, some *eminent persons*, especially of Fife and Angus, and some burghers of several towns, travelled over all the shires of Scotland exhorting all the people to love the sincere preaching of the Word, and not to suffer themselves and their friends of the same opinion in religion with themselves to be oppressed and destroyed by a small and weak faction; alleging, if their enemies would transact the matter by law, they could easily cast them, but if they chose force rather, they were not inferior to them; and they had schedules, or writing tables, ready for those who were pleased therewith to subscribe their names. These first assumed the name of the *Congregation;* which was made more famous afterwards by those who joined themselves thereto."

Thus the reformation began in Scotland chiefly by means of the disaffected nobles, instigated and urged on by Knox, at first alone, and, after awhile, by some of his ministerial coadjutors. The Queen Regent, who governed the kingdom at this time in the name of the young Queen Mary, was urged on by the Guises of France, a bigoted and persecuting race, to suppress these schismatic heretics, and maintain the Papal system at all events. The power of a Regency is always more feeble than that of Sovereignty itself. It was this that emboldened the exasperated nobility of Scotland. The historian just quoted says: "While matters were standing in this ticklish

posture, John Knox assembled the multitude at Perth, and made such an excellent sermon to them that he set their minds, already moved, *all in a flame.* After sermon, the greatest part of the audience went home to dinner; but a few of the meaner sort, [*the rascal multitude*, as Knox, in his own history, often calls them,] such as were also enraged with anger and indignation, staid behind in the church. Amongst them a poor Priest, thinking to try how they stood affected, prepared to say mass," &c. which brought on a riot, and raised an infuriated mob, who soon upset the Priest, and afterwards demolished the shrines, altars, and monuments of idolatry, wherever they were found in the whole city. "These things were done by the meaner sort, while the nobles, clergy, and richer neighbors were at dinner. With the same furious violence they ran several ways to the Monastery of the Friars, while the rest of the common people were still flocking in to them; and, though the Friars had provided aid against these assaults, no force was able to resist the rash violence of the multitude. The first assault was made upon the images and church-stuff, and the poorer sort ran in to plunder. The Franciscans were immensely rich—the Dominicans not quite so opulent. The poor seized on all the wealth. Nay, the abstinence of the soldiers [for soldiers they had, as well as other auxiliaries] from plunder was as incredible as their celerity in demolishing the buildings was wonderful."

As an offset to Buchanan's statement, we will hear Professor Hodge's statement: "Besides, *the rigid doctrine of the exclusive Divine right of Presbyterianism, and an intolerant opposition to Prelacy, did not prevail among the Scotch until they were driven by persecution into extreme opinions.*"* But, in the case before us, the reformation had scarcely began in Scotland, and the aggression was altogether on the side of the Reformers; yet we see the very same unyielding, impetuous, and intolerant spirit by which the Scotch have always been actuated in all their religious operations. But, to give also an instance of the Professor's great admiration and recommendation of every thing that is Scottish, we will hear him again on the subject: "The first confession of faith [says he] prepared by Knox and his associates asserted explicitly *the right and duty of the people* to resist the tyranny of their rulers. *This was the result of the reformation being carried on by the people.*"† We learn from Buchanan, Knox, and others, what kind of people they were, how excited, and how they went to work. Would not any one infer, from reading Professor Hodge's laudatory notice of this matter, that the people—the common people—were all now leavened with the principles of the reforma-

* See Professor Hodge's History, page 54. † See same, page 58.

tion? The people—*the rascal multitude*, as Knox calls them—at that time neither knew nor cared any thing about the reformation. It had not reached them—they had not yet emerged from gross Papal darkness; but were led on by their nobles and the heads of their clans, and instigated by the inflammatory zeal of Knox and a few others, just as they would be led to any marauding or military enterprise. It was plunder that enkindled their zeal, and prompted them to their exterminating and indiscriminately destructive course.

As the principles inculcated by the Reformers, and even the confession drawn up by Knox himself, taught the people that they had a right to resist their rulers and abolish their right to govern whenever they should judge they had exceeded the prescribed limits of their authority, the Reformers, with all whom they could prevail upon to follow them, abrogated the powers of Government lodged in the hands of the Regent; took the reins of Government into their own hands; demolished Popery and Prelacy; seized upon the property and wealth of the church; and plunged the country into a bloody civil war of unusual violence. The weakness and inefficiency of the Queen Regent's government; the death of the King of France, who had married their young Queen; the distraction in which their youthful widowed Mary, Queen of Scots, found the country when she came over from France and assumed the reins of government; her flight and imprisonment and death in England; and the long minority of James VI, then a young child—all conspired to give the Reformers the opportunity of entrenching and fortifying themselves with their new system of rigid, exclusive, Divine right Presbyterianism, throughout the whole realm.

This was the introduction of Scotch Reformation. Before the common people had time or opportunity of being instructed or indoctrinated in the principles of the reformation—before there were any Sessions, or Presbyteries, or Synods instituted—a few clergymen, with the nobility, formed themselves into a kind of General Assembly; planned, or rather adopted, the doctrinal confession of faith which Knox brought with him from Geneva; seized upon the patrimony of the church, as they called it; deposed the former Bishops, and appointed in their stead over their dioceses Superintendents, or a kind of itinerant Bishops with very limited powers, to take the old parishes under their care, remove disorderly and immoral incumbents, locate better Ministers where they could be found over the said parishes, and, where suitable Ministers could not be found, to appoint readers as a temporary supply. This was the model first established by the Reformers, and by their first General Assembly, in the plenitude of its newly assumed powers.

It would be needless to trace the various changes, and struggles, and per-

secutions through which the Church of Scotland has passed. It began in perilous times, and has weathered many a storm. When it obtained the victory over Popery, it assumed the place occupied by it as the established religion of the country—retaining all the property and advantages possessed by its predecessor, in churches, glebes, seminaries of learning, &c. It retained the same connexion with the civil authority, and contended for its rights and for the mastery, by weapons both carnal and spiritual. Its first organization was in the formation of a General Assembly, which adopted a confession of faith and form of government. All its powers commenced from and existed in a General Assembly, which organized inferior courts when it was found expedient and necessary, and imparted to the courts below such powers and privileges as it chose, and retained such as it chose. It began at the top and worked downward; and, as it had to struggle with vindictive and bitter enemies, so it required such a spirit and temper as might naturally have been expected from the conflicts through which it had to pass. It commenced in times of comparative darkness and ignorance respecting civil and religious rights, privileges, and freedom; and, becoming the established religion of the realm, it retained all the advantages thereby secured to itself, with a tenacity peculiar to the nation to the present day, to the exclusion of all other sects or denominations, excepting those in subordination to itself. From its rise to the present day it would fraternise with no other sect, admit none other into its pulpits or church judicatories, nor open a fraternal correspondence with any other. It was, and ever has been, uncompromising, illiberal, restrictive, and exclusive in its policy, because it claimed Divine right and authority for all its distinctive characters and features as a church, which left them no discretion for change or concession. It must be what it is, or nothing. It will unite with others upon one condition only, and that is, that they shall become Presbyterians like themselves. Such is rigid, strict, consistent, Scotch Presbyterianism. They have ever opposed toleration, because, according to their ideas, that would be to countenance error; and they were so rigid and restrictive in orthodoxy, that they made little or no distinction between doctrines—all were essential and of equal importance. To admit of the distinction *of essential and non-essential* in doctrines, is, according to them, a close approximation to error, if not a dangerous error of itself.* Hence, whenever Presbyterians of this stamp attempted to unite with others who were more moderate and less restrictive than themselves, as was the case during the Commonwealth of England, they would not amalgamate. In New England they wanted all their system, or nothing; and this accounts

* See Professor Hodge's History, page 10.

for their repeated attempts to have Presbyterianism established there by law, to the exclusion of all other denominations. When some Scotchmen settled in Newark, New Jersey, and, because they were so few themselves, had to unite with New England settlers who were there before them, they soon raised a storm that drove away Mr. Pierson, their Minister. The same occurred in the first church of New York. The like causes produced the schism in the Presbyterian church in 1741, and it is a spirit of the same kind which has divided and rent the church at present.

An investigation shall now be entered upon respecting the rise, progress, genius, and character of Presbyterianism in America, together with the time, circumstances, and manner of its introduction. It will be remembered that the seven first Ministers, with their respective congregations, by whom the Mother Presbytery, or, to speak more properly, the Infant Presbytery, was formed, were located as follows: One Minister, who was the master-spirit of the rest, the reverend and venerable Francis Makemie, the father of American Presbyterianism, was located, lived, and died in Accomack county, on the eastern shore of Virginia, adjoining the eastern shore of Maryland, and near the line of division between those two colonies, as they then were. Two others, Hampton and McNish, who were Presbyterians like Makemie, and whom he had been instrumental in bringing from Ireland to America, as will appear hereafter, were settled in what was then called Somerset, but now Worcester county, on the eastern shore of Maryland, adjoining Accomack, in Virginia, and separated from the latter by a right line running east and west, beginning at the mouth of Pocomoke river and ending on the eastern shore of the Atlantic ocean. The county of Somerset was a narrow tract of land, which separated Accomack county from the three lower counties bordering on the bay and river of Delaware, once claimed by Maryland, but finally included in the colony of Pennsylvania, settled by William Penn, and which now forms the small State of Delaware. The fourth of these Ministers, who was the intimate friend and companion of Makemie, was the Rev. Jedediah Andrews, originally a Congregationalist from Boston, but who now had the charge of a small newly formed congregation in Philadelphia. The Rev. John Wilson was settled about Newcastle and Whiteclay creek, on or near the river Delaware. The Rev. Samuel Davis was settled on the bay of Delaware, about Lewistown, and approaching the Maryland line. And the Rev. Nathaniel Taylor, it is thought, though of this we have nothing more than probable conjecture, was located on the eastern shore of the Delaware river, where we know there had long been a settlement of New Englanders, from about New Haven, for the express purpose of settling churches in Gospel order and purity, and to which Missionaries were often sent from New England.

This settlement came very early, if not from the beginning, under the care of the Presbytery.* We have already found out, from the earliest records

* We shall take this opportunity of correcting another of Professor Hodge's statements, page 66: "A considerable number of Scotch also settled in Maryland. Col. Ninian Bell, a native of Fifeshire, having become implicated in the troubles arising out of the conflict of Episcopacy, fled first to Barbadoes, and thence removed to Maryland, where he made an extensive purchase of land, covering much of the present site of Washington and Georgetown. He sent home to urge his friends and neighbors to join him in his exile, and had influence enough to induce about two hundred to come over. They arrived about 1690, bringing with them their Pastor, the Rev. Nathaniel Taylor, and formed the church and congregation of Upper Marlborough." This is said to be taken from a manuscript written by Doctor S. Balch; and is the only account I have ever yet met with of such a colony of Scotchmen settling in Maryland. We have evidence of some Scotch settlers in some parts of New York and East Jersey, but never in large numbers. There were a number of Highland adventurers who settled in North and South Carolina. There were individual Scotch merchants, factors, or adventurers, to be found in almost every settlement where there was an opening for speculation or accumulating money; but they were isolated individuals, more intent upon making a fortune than conducting a religious enterprise. Such was the celebrated Colonel Ninian Bell, who settled upon the Patuxent at Upper Marlborough. He became a very successful merchant, and was greatly distinguished as a warrior against Indians. He acquired a large fortune, bought much land, and left behind him a very numerous, respectable, and wealthy family of descendents.

The first accounts we hear of a congregration at Marlborough, was a petition sent to the Presbytery about the year 1715 or 1716, by a few Scotch merchants, and others, for supplies of preaching. Two members, Messrs. Conn and Orme, were sent to missionate in those regions, and look after the people at Marlborough, and others. Both of these Ministers settled west of the Chesapeake, in Maryland, and Mr. Conn was ordained and settled at Marlborough in the year 1716 as their first Minister, as the records of the Mother Presbytery will show. But this tale, that upwards of two hundred Scotch refugees from persecution came over in the year 1690 and settled a church there, with their Scotch Minister, Mr. Nathaniel Taylor, stumbles all belief. Good old Dr. Balch must have heard of a Minister of that name who was among the original members of the Presbytery in 1705 or 1706; but that Nathaniel Taylor was another man, and located in another place; there never was a Minister settled at Marlborough before Mr. Conn, in 1716. And, let us ask, if there be any just foundation for this story, what has become of those two hundred Scotch families? They ought to have increased greatly by this time; but they have vanished as mysteriously as they were first made to appear.

Once more: How is it to be accounted for, that while Makemie was laboring solitary and alone, from 1690 to 1705, upon the opposite side of the Chesapeake, without the least ministerial assistance or neighborship until he brought over from Ireland Hampton and McNish to help him—how is it, we ask, that he never heard of this flourishing church of thorough-going Presbyterians, with his Scotch brother Taylor at their head, within so short a distance of him? The answer is, because such a Scotch church and Minister never existed; it was all a mistake; Doctor Balch must have been misinformed. Before the year 1716, the people and congregation of Marlborough were never mentioned or

and annals, what kind of population first occupied the borders of the bay and river of Delaware. They never had any English Minister settled in those parts until very recently, as we have seen already; and it is natural to conclude, in the absence of all other testimony, that, as we have heard of no English colonists settling in those regions but from New England, they would be supplied with Ministers from the same quarter. But more of this presently.

We shall spend a little time in inquiring from whence the Presbyterians originated who formed the congregations on the eastern shores of Maryland and Virginia, which were under the care of Makemie, McNish, and Hampton, who were settled there, and who were all unquestionably Presbyterian Ministers, originally from Ireland.

As the proprietary of the province of Maryland is known once to have claimed all the territory between the Potomac on the south and the Delaware on the north, and as the Marylanders, as they were called, at a period before this had commenced a settlement, as we have already seen, about the mouth of the Schuylkill, from whence they were, at that time, driven by the Dutch from New York, we may naturally suppose that the population of the eastern shore of Maryland was homogeneous with that which possessed the western shore of the Delaware, for they were close neighbors to each other. Moreover, Maryland had the credit of being the first of the colonies which admitted the free exercise of religion, without respect to sect or party, within its limits. The granting of liberty of conscience and religious freedom was a perfect anomaly among the nations of that day, and especially among Roman Catholics. While we must give Lord Baltimore —but more especially King Charles I, from whom that charter was obtained—due credit for the good system here broached, I cannot think there was as good a foundation for triumphing and boasting upon the occasion as that good and excellent writer, Irvine Spence, Esq., has claimed. It is easily

alluded to, in the minutes of the Presbytery, as being under their care. It is no wonder, then, that Professor Hodge is at a loss to reconcile this story from Doctor Balch with the account the Presbytery gives in 1710, when, in one of their letters to the Presbytery of Dublin, they say they had but four congregations in Maryland. These four congregations were those under the care of Hampton and McNish, each of whom had charge of two congregations on the eastern shore of Maryland. But now, to answer a purpose and find a *Scotch Minister*, Professor Hodge has undertaken to correct the old minutes of the Presbytery, by reminding them that they had forgotten two of their congregations—Marlborough and Rehoboth. The fact is, Marlborough, as a congregation, did not then exist; and Rehoboth, which was part of Makemie's charge, was then in Virginia—but the congregation afterward changed the site of their meeting-house over to the north side of Pocomoke, in Maryland, where it has remained ever since.

known by what motives those three bloody persecutors, Charles I, Charles II, and James II, of England, were actuated in their many attempts to establish religious freedom and tolerance in their governments. Nobody was deceived by this finesse of theirs. It was only designed to introduce and assist their favorites, the Catholics, and reinstate them in England again. More illiberal and hypocritical monsters can scarcely be found than these men were, and their actions always showed it when they were free to act. It is probable that Lord Baltimore, if consulted at all, was actuated by a less censurable motive. A useful lesson had been learned from Virginia, which colony was depressed and kept in a languid and feeble condition during their whole progress, compared with New England and others, by their very illiberal, bigoted, and persecuting policy. Lord Baltimore learned a useful lesson among them himself; and, being anxious that his new colony should be speedily filled with enterprising adventurers, this was the true policy for him to pursue. It is well that man can be constrained to pursue a right course by any means, even if they should be of a sinister or selfish nature.

The liberal and generous terms held out by Maryland to those who were oppressed and banished their homes, soon caused her wilderness to bud and blossom as the rose, and made even the sands of the eastern shore to assume another aspect. Emigrants were attracted to this warm and genial climate, and friendly asylum, from England, both Old and New, from France, and elsewhere; but I dare not say from Scotland, except in individual cases, for, if the Scotch were found to be enamored with religious freedom and toleration in this country, it was more than could ever be said of them on the other side of the ocean. They might, *for once*, love the treason, but not the traitor. The rich Catholics hovered about their proprietary, and located themselves in the much more fertile and desirable parts on the west of the Chesapeake bay, while Puritans, and Swedes, and Dutch, and French, and English—Lutherans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians—were left at liberty to take undisturbed possession upon the seaboard. Even Accomack in Virginia was benefitted by a vicinage of the kind, which made that and the adjoining county of Northampton an exception from the general character of persecuting Virginia. This detached part of Virginia, from the commencement, was a kind of Baronial territory, affording a refuge from danger and oppression. Even that relentless persecutor, Lord Berkely, in times of adversity could fly to Accomack for shelter from his offended countrymen. And it was here in Accomack, near the Maryland line, which could easily and quickly be stepped over, that we shall find the cradle in which the infant church of the Presbyterians was rocked into life, and made to grow, like its Master, in stature and in favor with God and man.

I feel impatient to get hold of this subject, to do it justice, and disabuse American Presbyterianism of the aspersions attempted to be thrown upon its fair character; but we are not quite ready for it yet. We must hold back a while longer, until we can show how that extraordinary man, Makemie, came to be located in Accomack, where he could safely stand and wield his powerful lever in all the circumjacent regions. This is a subject but little understood, and, for want of correct knowledge respecting it, great mistakes are made and very wrong conclusions drawn. The true character and history of Makemie had become almost lost to the world, and it is only of late that it has begun to be called up from almost total oblivion. But old records, found in the Clerk's offices of Accomack and Somerset counties, and a few musty and half destroyed documents and pamphlets, may yet enable us to do justice, but only imperfect justice, to that apostle of American Presbyterianism. When he first arrived—where he commenced his labors—through what changes and trials he had first to pass—or whence and how he came to America, are yet but imperfectly known.

To avoid incumbering our historical narrative, for the future, with so many and such lengthy documents and extracts, we shall now, although it may seem premature and out of the natural order, insert the letters of correspondence which the Presbytery, at its commencement, carried on with individuals and bodies at a distance. These authentic documents will not only make known the state of the church and country, at the time they were written, but, by referring to scenes which were past, they will throw back light upon facts and circumstances, without which our narrative in advance would scarcely be understood or credited.

The first of those letters will be one addressed by the Presbytery to the Rev. Messrs. Davenport, Webb, Shane, and Buckingham, of Connecticut.* The people from this State had long had settlements upon lands which they had purchased in Jersey, and on both sides of the bay and river of Delaware, to whom they had been in the habit of sending supplies of preaching.

* The year before this letter was written, we learn from the records of the Presbytery that Messrs. Andrews and Makemie were directed to write to a Mr. Alexander Colden, a Minister at Oxnam, in Scotland, with whom the people about Lewistown on the Delaware bay had some how became acquainted, and urge him to come over and settle there in compliance with the wishes of that people; and Mr. Wilson was directed to write to the Presbytery of ——— in Scotland, to which Mr. Colden belonged, to obtain their consent that he might come and settle at Lewistown. But this application was ineffectual; Mr. Colden did not comply with their wishes, and the letters which were written upon this occasion, having not been recorded, are lost.

"MAY 24, 1708.

"*Reverend and Dear Brethren:* Through the good providence of our Lord Jesus Christ assisting us, we, the Ministers of the Gospel of the Presbyterian persuasion in this province, and those adjacent, taking into our serious consideration the care and circumstances of our holy religion in those parts, have, to our great toil and labor, and great difficulty to divers of us, by reason of our great distance from one another, formed ourselves into a Presbytery, [this was only three years after their formation,] annually to be convened for the furthering and promoting the true interests of religion and godliness. In which our undertaking, as we would not have any thing to be advanced that may justly be disgustful to any pious soul, but the contrary, so it is our universal desire to walk in the *nearest union and fellowship* with the churches in those parts where you inhabit; not knowing any difference of opinion so weighty as to inhibit such a proposal, nor doubting of your cordial assent thereto.*

"And for a testimony of our sincerity and real intentions to act as has been mentioned, we conclude it convenient to lay before you one difficult matter that has been (to our great trouble and exercise) laid before us, and also what has been our advice about it; holding proper to do so, because you yourselves have been concerned in a transaction that has, in some measure, led unto it. We find, by divers letters that have passed between you and sundry persons in Woodbridge, that you are not unacquainted with the confusion and distractions arising from the accession of Mr. Wade to be the Minister of that town, and the aversion of a considerable part of the people to the accepting of him as such. And therefore we need only mention what we, after mature deliberation and consultation, have advised for the healing of the differences among them, upon the application of those that disagree with Mr. Wade, made unto us; concluding, that if their contentions and animosities continue, it may be of unhappy consequence, viz: That Mr. Boyd, Minister of Freehold, should, if desired by the dissenting party, (which, for distinction, may be so termed,) come and preach at Woodbridge one Lord's day every three weeks, in the public meeting-house there, if it may, as we hope it will, be admitted; and if it be not allowed of, to prevent any open and visible breach as much as may be, that he should preach at Amboy, or any other place agreed upon, provided it be not within the town of Woodbridge. And have left it to their liberty and

* How different this language is from that used by our modern Reformers, who are such great sticklers for the rigid Scotch system. Either these Reformers or the Mother Presbytery did not understand what the Scotch system was, or one or the other pursued a very different policy.

discretion, according to the light of their consciences, guided by the infallible Word of God, either to join, or not to join, with Mr. Wade in the time of Mr. Boyd's absence. This, we thought, after a great deal of perplexity about it, to be all that we could propose at present for the satisfying the gentlemen that have requested our help and counsel, and as the most ready expedient we could think upon, in the present exigency of affairs among them, for their mutual reconciliation and comfort. Moreover, as you have been employed in Mr. Wade's fixing there, and we hope with sincere aims to the good of the place, so long groaning under the unhappiness of the want of a settled ministry, so we humbly conceive you are in duty bound, in a special manner, to put forth your helping hand to rescue them from the miserable inconveniences that now they labor under, by all the ways that you can, to which we hope your advice for mutual forbearance may have much force. The disadvantages, by such things as these, administered to the power and life of religion, and our common cause, with the occasion given to them that would rejoice in our ruin, we need not inform you of, and therefore promise ourselves that nothing will be wanting on your part for accommodating those differences. And, in the meantime, we request your charitable constructions upon what we have directed unto, in so difficult a matter, if it do not prove to be according to your own sentiments; seeing it is according to the best of our light. Thus hoping that our churches and ourselves, in this dark part of the world, shall be remembered in your supplications to that God in whom are all our springs, and from whom is all our help, directions, and success, we subscribe ourselves your brethren in the hope of the Gospel."

A few remarks shall now be made upon this letter, and the occasion on which it was written, as calculated to throw some light upon the state of the church at that day, and the sentiments and principles upon which its Ministers then acted.

1. We see from this letter that the members of the Presbytery acted entirely in accordance with the principle of the Union formed in London between Presbyterians and Congregationalists—that they had a desire to walk in the *nearest union and fellowship* with the churches in New England, and that *they knew no difference in opinion among them so weighty as to inhibit such union and fellowship*. They were willing that their feeble churches, which were composed of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, should worship together under the same ministry, of either party, rather than live without the means of Grace and the preached Word. The advice they gave on the occasion was, for them to live together in peace, if possible, but if not, that each party have its own Minister, and that they should mutually attend the ministrations of the other party when not supplied by their own;

that, in fact, there was no such weighty differences among them as to prevent their uniting together under the same mode of worship, &c.

Query. Is this not the very same principle by which the Act of Union of 1801 was formed to assist weak congregations on frontier settlements? And would not those founders of American Presbyterianism have sanctioned such a plan, as perfectly consistent with the plan upon which they associated in forming their Presbytery?

2. We see with what tenderness and Christian courtesy they treated their brethren in Connecticut; how anxious they were to conciliate them, and secure their concurrence in measures to build up their weak and infant churches. Noble-hearted fathers and founders of American Presbyterianism! Would that their successors had always imitated them!

3. We learn here what was the cause of the early disturbances in the churches in East Jersey, about Newark, Woodbridge, &c. History informs us, and Professor Hodge owns it, that there was a mixture of Scotch settlers among these New Englanders. This ousted Pierson from Newark, and caused the troubles at Woodbridge. There was no such Scotch mixture on the Delaware, or in West Jersey, as yet; hence the peace and quiet with which they got on there. Strict and rigid Scotch principles will ever operate in the same way, and produce the same effects, from their illiberal and exclusive nature.

4. We learn by this letter from whence the New English settlements in Jersey and on the Delaware sought and obtained Ministers to supply them in their necessitous circumstances. Before the formation of the Presbytery they came exclusively from New England; and since, partly from the same source, and partly from the Presbytery, as they had the means in their power.

There is in the letter book a long and respectful letter from the Presbytery to Cotton Mather, of Boston, requesting him to interfere with his influence to persuade Mr. Wade to leave Woodbridge, that a Mr. Gillespie might settle there; but this letter will be omitted. The next letter I shall insert was written by the Presbytery, May, 1709, to Sir Edmund Harrison, a gentleman of high standing and influence among the Dissenters in and about London, to enlist him and the Dissenters of London in their favor, that they might continue, as they had done heretofore, to send them supplies of men and money. It is as follows:

"*Honorable Sir:* The distressed condition of these provinces, with respect to religion, in which the providence of God has cast our lot, has moved us to apply to the Reverend Ministers of Boston, in New England, to join with us in addressing yourself, and other charitable gentlemen in London, to consider the state of these countries, and to implore your help and

assistance for promoting the interests of our glorious Lord. To our great satisfaction they have readily complied with our desire, and have drawn up and signed a letter particularly directed to yourself. And that we, for our parts, may not be wanting, being informed of that excellent spirit in you, famed both for piety and prudence, do likewise address ourselves unto your honor upon the same account.

"The negotiation begun, and encouraged by a fund, *in the time when our worthy friend* Mr. Makemie (now deceased) was with you, for evangelizing these colonies, was a business exceedingly acceptable to a multitude of people, *and was likely to have been of great service* if it had been continued in; which makes us much grieved that so valuable a design was so soon after its beginning laid aside. The necessity for carrying on the same affair being as great, if not greater now, than it was then, we hope that the patriots in London will revive so good and important a work, and not let it be buried in ashes, but that some suitable method be taken that it may be set on foot again. Unto whom can we apply ourselves more fitly *than unto our fathers*, who have been extolled in the reformed churches for their large bounty and benevolence in their necessities? We doubt not but if the sum of about two hundred pounds per annum were raised for the encouragement of Ministers in these parts, it would enable Ministers and people to erect eight congregations, and ourselves put in better circumstances than hitherto we have been. *We are, at present, seven Ministers*, most of whose outward affairs are so straitened as to crave relief; unto which if two or three more were added, it would greatly strengthen our interest, which does miserably suffer as things at present are among us. Sir, if we shall be supplied with Ministers from you, which we earnestly desire, with your benevolence to the value above said, you may be assured of our fidelity and Christian care in distributing it to the best ends and purposes we can; so as, we hope, we shall be able to give a just and fair account for every part of it, to yourself and others, by our letters to you. It is well known what advantages the Missionaries from England have of us, from the settled fund of their church, which not only liberally supports them here, but encourages too many insolencies, both against our persons and interests, which sorrowfully looking on we cannot but crave your remedy.* That our evangelical affairs may be better managed, we have formed ourselves into a Presbytery, annually to be convened in this city, [Philadelphia,] at which times it is a sore distress and trouble unto us that we are not able to com-

* This refers to the Society for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts, formed in London by the Episcopal church of England in the year 1701. It is supposed that the formation of this Society was quickened by the plan formed in London a few years before by Dissenters, of sending Missionaries to preach to the destitute Colonies in America.

ply with the desires of sundry places crying unto us for Ministers to deal forth the word of life unto them. Therefore we most earnestly beseech you, in the bowels of our Lord, to intercede with the Ministers of London and other well affected gentlemen to extend their charity and pity unto us, to carry on so necessary and glorious a work; otherwise many people will remain in a perishing condition as to spiritual things. In so doing we, your humble supplicant, shall ever pray that the blessing of God's throne and footstool may be conferred upon you and them.

"P. S. The death of that worthy and honorable person, Lord Lovelace, we are afraid will prove detrimental to our interest, and we could wish that his place were filled again with a person of such a spirit and temper as he appeared to be of.

"We desire that what you shall please to transmit to us, as to letters or otherwise, may be directed to Mr. Andrews, or, in his absence, to Mr. David Griffing and Mr. William Allen, Philadelphia."

I shall now give another letter, written the next year, to the Presbytery of Dublin, in Ireland, which is the following:

"*The Presbytery met in Philadelphia, September*, 1710, *to the Reverend Presbytery of Dublin wisheth grace, mercy, peace, the bond of fellowship, and prosperity in the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.*

"*Reverend and dear Brethren in the Lord:* By a letter from the Rev. Alexander Sinclare, a member of your society, and directed to Mr. John Henry, one of our number, we find you desire a correspondence may be settled and continued, from time to time, than which nothing can be more acceptable to us poor, scattered, and far-dispersed laborers in our Lord's vineyard. As also you desire an account of our ecclesiastical affairs, and promise all the assistance yourselves can afford, or procure by assistance from others, the former we are ready to give, and for the latter promise we are very grateful.

"As to the state of the church in these parts, our interest truly is very weak; and we cannot relate this matter without sorrow of heart, since it is too much owing to the neglect of Ministers at home. Our late Rev. brother Makemie prevailed with the Ministers of London to undertake the support of two itinerants for the space of two years, and, after that time, to send two more upon the same condition, allowing the former after that time to settle; which, if accomplished, had proved of more than credible advantage to these parts, considering how far scattered most of the inhabitants are. But, alas! they drew back their hand, and we have reason to lament their deficiency. Had our friends at home been equally watchful and diligent as the Episcopal Society at London, our interest in most foreign plantations probably might have carried the balance.

1. This distinguished dissenting gentleman of London was requested to use his influence and intercession with the Ministers of London in behalf of this infant Presbytery; and the Congregational Ministers of Boston, who were supposed to have weight and influence with the persons above alluded to, were requested to second the application now made. The questions here naturally arise, who was Sir Edmund Harrison, whose fame pervaded all the churches, and who were those Ministers with whom he was connected, and over whom he was supposed to have influence? Respecting Sir Edmund Harrison I am constrained to acknowledge, after diligent search, that I can gather nothing more than what may be learned from the letter itself. He was a distinguished and ennobled dissenting gentleman, who had great influence in and about London, both with the clergy and laity of the Dissenting interests, and one whose acts of piety and generosity had become generally known.

As to the Dissenting Ministers about London, they could have been no others than the Independents, or Congregationalists, or the Presbyterians. But since the year 1689 or 1690, these two societies, as heretofore shown, had united in one body, and dropped all the distinctive characters by which they had heretofore been known, and, under the Plan of Union then formed, were known as the United Brethren of London. To whom else could a united application from the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of America so naturally be made? It would be useless to consume time in trying to remove doubt from a subject where no doubt can exist. It was, then, to a catholic, pious, and enterprising number of Ministers about London, with the celebrated Calamy the younger at their head. (He was Edmund Calamy the third, who wrote so nobly in defence of the non-conforming Puritans.) Here, then, we have found solid ground to take our stand upon.

2. Another inquiry here started is, when was that negotiation begun and entered into with our Makemie, here spoken of, which had afterwards died away, and was found buried in ashes, and which our venerable founders and fathers were so anxious now to revive? Attention to a few dates and facts may throw some light upon this subject. When was this Union between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in London entered into? In 1689 or 1690, about twenty years before the date of this letter. When do we first hear of Makemie in America? It will be shown presently, from authentic documents, that Makemie is first mentioned upon the records of the county court of Accomack, in Virginia, as settling in that county in the year 1690. Here is a singular coincidence of dates.*

* I at first supposed it probable that Makemie first visited Barbadoes on his way to Virginia, and preached there awhile; then located himself on Elizabeth river, and labored

Again: Who was in London from America at the time, and had so prominent a part in bringing about that Union of Presbyterians and Congregationalists? Why, that indefatigable and enterprising Minister of the Gospel from Massachusetts, the Rev. Increase Mather. It is quite natural to suppose, after finding the influence he had in London, his zeal for his country, whose situation and circumstances he was well acquainted with, would rather be excited than otherwise to promote the spiritual interests of America, when deputised, as he was, to look after her temporal welfare. If he had not thought of looking out for, and engaging Missionaries to come over to supply some of the most destitute parts of the country when so fair an opening offered itself, it would cast a stigma on his character that he would unwillingly bear, and we should as unwillingly attribute to that remarkable man.

Again: Makemie had been in America from the year 1690, and did return to Europe again before 1704, as we shall show in due time; during which interval he was the only English Presbyterian Minister in America, from the limits of New York to the Gulf of Mexico. The negotiation he entered into, and which brought him to America, (for he was sent out by a company of gentlemen from London, as Doctor Miller, in his Life of Doctor Rodgers, justly observes,) had then been long laid aside and buried in ashes. This benevolent plan he contrived again, in 1704, to rekindle from its ashes, and it was the means of sending over two more Missionaries, Hampton and McNish, whom he brought over with him from his mother country Ireland, on his return in the spring of 1705; all which shall be made to appear from other documents, as well as from the next letter, addressed to the Presbytery of Dublin, which the reader has just perused.

Let these things be all put together, and they furnish as strong presump-

there, and in the circumjacent regions, until he was forced by persecution to fly across the Chesapeake bay and fix his abode in Accomack; but, upon more mature reflection, this opinion has been given up for one against which fewer objections can be raised. My reasons for this change of opinion are: 1. The Act of Toleration was passed by William and Mary in the year 1689. Makemie, while in Barbadoes, availed himself of the privileges of this act; he could not, therefore, have done this before the year 1690, when he first settled in Accomack. 2. If Makemie had been laboring in his mission twenty or thirty years before he commenced his labors in Accomack, as I once supposed, and as Mr. Spence contends, he must have been at his death between eighty and ninety years old. But this is inadmissible when we consider the laborious duties he performed up to the period of his death, and his having lately married, leaving two infant daughters when he died. He must, therefore, have performed and finished all his extensive works and labors of love after his settlement at Accomack in the year 1690, which was only eighteen years before his death.

tive evidence as can be desired by a candid inquirer after truth, of the following facts and conclusions:

1. That the Rev. Francis Makemie was led to come to America by the United Brethren of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of London, at or about the time they formed their celebrated Plan of Union in 1689 or 1690. There has been no evidence yet found to show in which of these years it was effected, but there is a certainty that it was about that time.

2. The negotiation, or engagement, entered into by Mr. Makemie and these brethren had long been laid aside, but was revived again when Makemie went over to England, as we shall soon prove he did; and his returning with two other fellow-laborers with him goes far to prove that McNish and Hampton (of whom we shall presently say more) were sent out by the same company or society in London.

3. The Rev. Messrs. Makemie, Hampton, and McNish, the first Presbyterian Missionaries that came to America, being sent out from the United Ministers of London, we may learn what kind of Presbyterianism they brought over with them and planted in the Mother Presbytery, which was organized principally through their agency; and here also we may learn what was the character of American Presbyterianism in its commencement, if we had no evidence arising from their records and mode of conducting business, (of which more hereafter.) These were all Union Presbyterians, associated under a plan of union much less in conformity with the rigid Scotch system than the Cambridge or Saybrook Platforms were, as may be seen by comparing them; ay, and by no means as Presbyterian in its character as the celebrated Plan of Union of 1801, of which we have heard so much of late. Quere. Would these seven members of the Mother Presbytery have hesitated to enter into such a plan as that of 1801? Or would they have thought it would vitiate their whole system? I pause for a reply. I have always been a Presbyterian upon the liberal American system, and love it still, and hope to end my days in such a spirit and connexion. By the term American Presbyterianism, I mean one who decidedly prefers the Presbyterian system of government to either Prelacy or Democratic Independency, but not to the extent of setting up its claims, with its jure divino and exclusive pretensions, so as to refuse intercourse, fellowship, or tolerance with any other system but its own. It is Presbyterianism more upon the principle of expediency than of Divine right, which excludes expediency altogether.

4. In the letter to the Synod of Glasgow dated in 1710, five years after their formation, they say their number was then *ten* in all, including those from Maryland, Pennsylvania, with the counties on the Delaware, and Jersey. But they were in great hopes and expectation that others in their

neighborhood would soon join them. Who were those neighboring Ministers who had not given in their adhesion? If, according to Professor Hodge, Doctor Green, and others, they had been based from the first upon the strict Scotch system, these reluctant hesitating neighbors could not have been Scotch or Irish Presbyterians, for there could have been no hesitation in such a case. They were Congregationalists who had not yet Presbyterianized sufficiently to desire such a connexion. But if Congregational predilections be so dangerous, and contain such deleterious poison as has lately been found in them, either these fathers of the church were very short-sighted and erroneous in their wishes, or their successors have imbibed a different spirit, and departed from original American Presbyterianism.

5. In the years 1709 and 1710, the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ireland knew little or nothing of what was going on in attempting to introduce Presbyterianism into America. Mr. Sinclaré, of Dublin, and Mr. Brown, of Glasgow, had heard some vague accounts from some source or other respecting it. The former writes to his countryman Henry, who had become Makemie's successor after his death, and the latter to some acquaintance in America, to write to them, and open a correspondence with them upon the subject. Sinclare had countrymen of his among the Ministers to whom he could write, but Brown had not one Scotch brother clergyman to whom he could write for information, but was forced to write "*to some good friend of theirs.*" From this I infer that neither the Church of Scotland nor Ireland, as such, had any hand or agency in introducing Presbyterianism into America, but that it originated from some other quarter; for, although it has often been said that all the original members of the Mother Presbytery, except Mr. Andrews of Philadelphia, were originally from Scotland or Ireland, these are all gratuitous assertions that do not rest upon a particle of evidence, while there is strong evidence to the contrary, as shall appear hereafter. The first Minister from Scotland, that we know to be such, was Mr. George Gillespie, a licentiate from the Presbytery of Glasgow, who came over probably in 1712; for we find in the records of the Presbytery an order for his ordination passed in May, 1713. Young Gillespie was no doubt induced to come to America in consequence of this very urgent letter of 1710, entreating that Ministers might be sent from Scotland —for the good and unsuspicious authors of that letter would make Ministers welcome, come from what quarter they might, so that they bore clean papers from some of the Evangelical or Reformed churches. But sorely did they pay for it afterwards, as we shall hear in due season. At the time, they felt so seriously for the cause of Christ and the perishing souls of men that they rejoiced that Christ was preached by any one—"*Yea, therein*

they did rejoice." Would that such a spirit had always characterized our church! When shall honest, confiding times return among us again? Call this latitudinarianism, or what you may, it was the kind of ism of the Mother Presbytery until innovations of another kind marred her peace and destroyed her unity.

The last observation I shall make respecting the Mother Presbytery at that early day, as inferrible from these letters, will relate to her small beginning, *the paucity of her numbers*, the scantiness of their resources, and the obstacles with which they had to contend. Let it be remembered that these remarks refer to the first eight or ten years of their existence, when forming the character of their church and establishing the polity they meant to be governed by. After reading Professor Hodge's flattering account, we can hardly be prepared for such a doleful account as they give of themselves, and of their situation. Hear the Professor's account—after finding Presbyterians (and those not few) in every new company of emigrants that arrived, and a laborious research into histories and annals down to the middle of the eighteenth century, when he poured in the Scotch and Irish by hundreds and thousands from New England to Georgia, he says, pages 68, 69: "From this slight and imperfect view of the several classes of people by whom our country was settled, it is evident *that a broad foundation for the Presbyterian church was laid from the beginning*. The English Puritans were all Calvinists, and many of them were Presbyterians; the Dutch were Calvinists and Presbyterians; a moiety at least of the Germans were of the same class; all the French Protestants were Calvinists and Presbyterians; and so, of course, were the Scotch and Irish. Of the several classes, the Dutch and Germans formed distinct ecclesiastical organizations, and subsist as such to the present time. In a multitude of cases, however, their descendants mingled with the descendants of other Presbyterians, and have entered largely into the materials of which our church is composed. The same remark applies to the descendants of the French Protestants, who have generally joined either the Episcopal or Presbyterian church. The early influence of the New England Puritans was, as has been seen, nearly confined to Long Island and East Jersey. Of those who settled in Jersey, a portion were, no doubt, inclined to Congregationalism; others of them were Presbyterians. All the Ministers, according to Mr. Andrews, were of the latter class." [It is astonishing that he could suffer such a statement as this to pass off without qualification or explanation; we may probably notice this hereafter, when we come to let Mr. Andrews speak for himself.] "*The strict Presbyterian emigrants*—Scotch, Irish, Dutch, and French—*laid the foundation* of our church in New York, East Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and the Caro-

linas, through which provinces, as has been shown, they were early extended in great numbers. This review accounts for the rapid increase of the Presbyterian church in this country." "This is no matter of surprise, when it is seen that so large a portion of the emigrants were Presbyterians. As they merged their diversities of national character into that of American citizens, so the Scotch, [the Scotch always first,] Irish, French, Dutch, and German Presbyterians became united in thousands of instances in the American Presbyterian church." It is a fine thing, sometimes, to have a lively imagination; but if care is not taken, Pegasus will run away with us. Our learned Professor must have forgotten the contents of these letters when he made such unguarded and sweeping assertions. This state of things, he says, existed *from the beginning*, when the church was struggling for existence, and assuming a character from strict Scotch Presbyterians. If his statements are correct, one would suppose that it was only necessary for some Presbyterian Minister to take a stand, no matter where, provided he could be seen, hoist his standard, and unfurl the Presbyterian banner with the Scotch thistle on it, and a flourishing church could be formed at once. Or, to use a Scripture phrase, "I will hiss for them and gather them, for I have redeemed them, and they shall increase as they have increased." Zech. 10, 8. What would those fathers have thought of a letter written in this strain to their brethren in Europe, respecting the state of their churches and their prospects?

After a few more documents calculated to shed light upon the subject, we shall resume, more directly, the history of the rise and progress of American Presbyterianism. In the year 1716, the Mother Presbytery was divided, and a Synod formed. The Synod wrote the following letter to the Rev. John Boyle, Minister in Dublin, to be communicated to the Presbytery of Dublin:

"PHILADELPHIA, *September* 17*th*, 1718.

"*Reverend Brethren:* It may be presumed that you are not wholly strangers to the circumstances of these parts; how many poor souls are scattered to and fro in this wilderness, in awful danger of perishing for lack of vision. But it must be a matter of great satisfaction to you, to be informed of the earnest breathings of many small and poor places among us after the most precious privileges of Gospel ordinances, and of the late addresses of sundry of them to us for supply.

"But, dear sirs, the paucity and poverty of these people render them utterly incapable to support the ministry among them, could they obtain it, and there lies, therefore, upon them a deplorable necessity of continuing in the same circumstances of darkness that they are now in, which may render both themselves and their posterity miserable Pagans, unless some

method can be found out for their speedy assistance in the maintaining of such Ministers as we would direct them to, which is what we are at present entirely unable to compass. And yet, in faithfulness to our great Lord and the souls of these poor people, we dare not but use our utmost essays to strengthen their hands, in this day of small things, lest this spark, which is but newly kindled, may be utterly extinguished; which gives occasion for this address unto you, for your charitable assistance in so momentous an affair.

"We have heard of the liberality of many gentlemen and others of our persuasion with you, on such like occasions, and dare not, therefore, doubt of their cheerful compliance with this our request, when you shall have communicated these circumstances to them. Thus earnestly petitioning your endeavors for the relief of these poor people, and your answer to this address, we conclude with recommending you and your religious concerns to the guidance and blessing of our common Lord.

"Signed in the name, and by the appointment of the Synod.

"Be pleased to direct yours to the Rev. Jedediah Andrews, Minister at Philadelphia."

Here follows another letter to the friends and benefactors in London:

"*To the much honored and very reverend Dissenting Ministers at London:* The representation of their unworthy brethren met at Philadelphia, September 16th, 1718:

"1. That, though it has pleased God to afflict them much by a removal of several of their number who were useful, yet it has also pleased the same gracious God, daily, rather to increase than decrease their number, by a continual supply of more than have been taken away; which to them is some comfortable evidence that God has some good work to do in these parts of the world.

"2. That there are now in number twenty-three ordained Ministers and three probationers, who all have agreed to unite their endeavors annually at Philadelphia for spreading and propagating the Gospel of Christ in these dark parts of the world, viz: in the provinces of New York, the Jerseys, Pennsylvania and its territories, [meaning the three lower counties on the Delaware, which were then so called,] Maryland, and Virginia; in all which provinces, except the last, some of the aforesaid Ministers reside. [After the death of Makemie none of their Ministers lived in Virginia; though Mr. Henry settled at Rehoboth, at the mouth of Pocomoke river, which had been under the care of Makemie, and lay at this time over the line on the Maryland side; and Mr. Macky, on Elizabeth river, never joined the Presbytery, and soon was forced to leave Virginia.]

"3. That all these Ministers or probationers aforesaid are either already settled or have prospects of settlement.

"4. That, notwithstanding, there are still many vacancies who cry to us for help in their desolate condition; and the seeming good disposition of some among them give us good ground to hope, that if they could be provided with able and faithful Ministers, the happy effects of it would soon appear.

"5. That most of those places yet to be planted with a Gospel Ministry are incapable at present of sufficiently supporting Ministers among them, and therefore crave help of all well-disposed Christians every where, especially if it can possibly be had from the city of London.

"6. That we ourselves have begun a small fund, for this and other religious purposes among us; but, alas! it is yet so small that little or nothing can be done by it.

"7. That there is nothing we desire more than the honor and comfort of a yearly correspondence with our very reverend and dear brethren, whom we so much esteem in the Lord; if it were but to have your countenance, concurrence, and advice, in the great and common work of our Lord and his kingdom.

"Lastly. These things we have presumed, in great humility, to lay before you, hoping they may have some good effect to the glory of God, the good of his church, your satisfaction, comfort, and refreshment; which that they may so prove, is the earnest prayer of, honored and respected sirs, yours in the Lord."

We shall give no more documents from the Letter-Book of the Mother Presbytery. It will be necessary, however, to go a little ahead in time, and give a communication, which will throw as much light upon the early history of our church as any other, that has providentially fallen in our way. It is a letter from the Rev. Jedediah Andrews, one of the original members of the Presbytery, and the intimate friend of Makemie. These two were the master-spirits by whose influence the Presbytery was chiefly formed. Makemie controlled the Presbyterian, and Andrews the Congregational materials which entered into that ecclesiastical polity, and which were the origination of American Presbyterianism, and gave it its distinctive features in contradistinction to the strict, rigid, and exclusive Scotch system. This letter may be found in the Register of Pennsylvania, published by Samuel Hazard, of Philadelphia, vol. 1, No. 182, July 2, 1831. The gentleman who furnished Mr. Hazard with this precious monument of antiquity was from Boston, and he also furnished notices of Mr. Andrews's family and history to this amount: The Rev. Jedediah Andrews

was born in Hingham, July 7th, 1674, the son of Captain Thomas Andrews, and grandson of Captain Thomas Andrews, one of the first settlers in New England, who died in 1640. He was an alumnus of Harvard College of the class of 1695, and Minister of a Presbyterian church in Philadelphia in 1698. He died in 1747. This letter, plain and unpretending as it is, sheds great light upon the early history of the Presbyterian church. It was written to the Rev. Mr. Prince, of Boston, in answer to inquiries made by him in relation to certain points upon which he was seeking information, and is as follows:

"PHILADELPHIA, *October* 14, 1730.

*"*Reverend Sir:* I received yours by Mr. Oliver; thank you for it, and take the distinct account you were pleased to give of your father, his affairs, and family, as a token of respect; not doubting but that covenant blessings are entailed and secured to your family by covenant promises, which are yea and amen in Christ Jesus.

"I suppose what you call Middleborough is the same that was called Plimton, when I was in New England twenty-one years ago, and had occasion to be up in that part of the country on a visit to my brother who lives at Rochester, who is now the only brother I have left; having lost two desirable brothers about three years since. One died in August at Hingham, and the other, we reckon, was lost at sea in September, in the great storm that happened at that time; for he sailed from Boston about three or four days before that storm, and was never heard of since. My mother, an aged woman, lives at Hingham; she is about ninety-six, and has her sight restored perfectly for the last twenty-six years, and retains her understanding wonderfully, as I am informed. I am continually longing to come once more and see her before she dies, but the journey being long, and a multiplicity of business continually taking me up, I am doubtful whether I shall get the liberty to answer my desire.

"The help that was kindly afforded us from Boston was of singular use to us in enlarging our house, which would not, I think, have been done

* It is stated in Doctor Mease's Picture of Philadelphia, page 206, that, in the autumn of 1698, the Rev. J. Andrews came from New England to Philadelphia, and officiated as an Independent Minister. The Independents, who are also denominated Presbyterians, had by this time increased in numbers, and, after the removal of the Baptists, continued to meet at the house on Barbadoes lot, (where the Independents and Baptists, under the Rev. John Watt, had worshipped several years before, at the northwest corner of Second and Chestnut streets,) until they procured another in High street, where they erected a small house for worship in 1704, which was enlarged in 1729, and which is alluded to in Mr. Andrews's letter, about which time they adopted the Presbyterian form of government. See also J. F. Watson's Annals of Philadelphia, under the article Churches.

without it. [This took place the year before 1729, as was before mentioned.] It is now in a manner finished, and proves very favorable for enlarging our congregation. I heartily thank you for the present of your sermons, and, having perused them, think there was no need of excuses from hurry of business, &c. I rather admire how, in such a hurry, and so many avocations, they could be done so well; especially the election sermon, when your family was inoculated, which being a disputed practice, would you know have occasioned censure if they had not done well, and must necessarily cause more than ordinary concern at every uncomfortable symptom. A nephew of mine, son to my eldest brother Thomas, died of the small-pox taken that way. He was prentice to Doctor Bulfinch, a hopeful young man, about nineteen. His brother informs me he died in peace, declaring himself prepared, and not afraid to die.

"Such a multitude of people coming in from Ireland of late years, our congregations are multiplied in this province [i. e. Pennsylvania, mark] to the number of fifteen or sixteen, which are all, but two or three, furnished with Ministers—all Scotch and Irish but three or four. Besides divers new congregations that are forming by these *new-comers, we all call ourselves Presbyterians, none pretending to be called Congregationalists* in this province.* In the Jerseys there are some Congregational assemblies—that is, some of the people are inclined that way, being originally of New England—yet they all submit to our Presbyteries readily enough; and the Min-

*Mr. Andrews says that the emigration from Ireland had begun but of late years, and their settlements were chiefly in the interior parts of Pennsylvania. He calls them *new-comers*. Holmes's Annals, taken from Anderson, gives the following abstract of the *new-comers* in 1729, the year before Andrews's letter was written:

English and Welsh passengers and servants,	267
Scotch servants,	43
Irish passengers and servants,	1,155
Palatine passengers,	243
Arrived at Newcastle government alone, chiefly from Ireland, about	4,500
Total	6,208

This emigration, which had just then commenced, continued to increase for a number of years with surprising rapidity, until the interior of Pennsylvania, the western parts of Maryland, Virginia, and North and South Carolina were chiefly occupied by them. They were chiefly Irish. We see from the above list the proportion of Scotch among them, and they servants of the poorer class. Irish from the north of Ireland were called Scotch Irish, their ancestors having formerly come from Scotland. Professor Hodge, in quoting Holmes, when speaking of the Scotch Irish, changes it to Scotch and Irish; so anxious was he to get a spice of Scotch among us, and so hard run was he for materials and authority.

isters are all Presbyterian, though mostly from New England. There is, indeed, one congregation in the back part of Newark that don't join with us, neither Ministers nor people; but, besides that, all the rest do. There are in the Jerseys about a dozen congregations, but not all constantly supplied with preaching, though most of them are, and the rest getting into a settled way as fast as they can, and some new congregations growing up there also. There is, besides, in this province a vast number of Palatines, [Germans,] and they come in still every year. Those that come of late years are mostly Presbyterian, or, as they call themselves, *Reformed*—the Palatinate being about three-fifths of that sort of people. They did use to come to me for baptism for their children, and many have joined with us in the other sacrament. They never had a Minister until about nine years ago, who is a bright young man, and a fine scholar. He is at present absent, being gone to Holland to get money to build a church in this city; but they are scattered all over the country; those that live in town are mostly a kind of Gibeonites, hewers of wood, &c. They are a diligent, sober, frugal people, rarely charged with any misdemeanor. Many of that class who live in the country, and have farms, by their industry and frugal way of living, grow rich, for they can underlive the Britons, &c. The first comers of them were called Palatines because they came last from that country, but are mostly Switzers, being drove from the Canton of Bern, for they are Baptists and will not fight or swear. They do not shave their beards, and are many of them wealthy men, having got the best land in the province. They live sixty or seventy miles off, but come frequently to town with their wagons laden with skins, (which belong to the Indian traders,) butter, flour, &c. There are many Lutherans and some Reformed mixed among them. In other parts of the country they are chiefly Reformed; so that I suppose the Presbyterian party are as numerous as the Quakers, or near it.

"There has lately come over a Palatine candidate of the Ministry, who having applied to us at our Synod for ordination, it is left to three Ministers to do it. He is an extraordinary person for sense and learning. We gave him a question to discuss about Justification, and he has answered it in a whole sheet of paper in a very notable manner. His name is John Peter Miller,* and speaks Latin as readily as we do our vernacular tongue, and so does the other, Mr. Weis. The church party [i. e. Episcopalian] will not grow much, except in the town, where there is a great congregation of

* This John Peter Miller was a Mennonist, or Dunkard. Would they ordain such a man? There is something here that needs further explanation; this is too latitudinarian for me.

them. There are some few small congregations of them in the country. Though there be so many sorts of religion going on, we do not quarrel about it. We not only live peaceably, but seem to love one another.*

"As to civil affairs, we have a charter granted by Mr. Penn, which is ample enough. The Assemblies are chosen yearly, (for we have one in the province and another in the territories,) and meet upon their own adjournments. The people choose the Sheriffs and Coroners, that is, two of a sort, out of which the Governor (who is Penn's Lieutenant) takes which he pleases. The Justices and Judges are put in by the Governor, in which matter he may use his own pleasure, but usually consults his Council. The Council has no part in the Legislature—that lies on the Representatives and Governor, but he still advises with his Council, which is of his own choice. Justice among us is usually administered impartially. The Government inclines to lenity rather than to severity.

"In this city we have a Mayor, twelve Aldermen, and twelve Common Councilmen. The Mayor is chosen annually; all the Aldermen are justices of the peace within the bounds of the city. The Mayor, some Alderman sitting with him, holds court four times a year, and tries causes criminal, but not capital, that fall out in the city, and so fines, whips, and pillories, as matters are. Our laws go both to the Proprietor and the Crown for approbation. Two negatives at home some have thought a hardship. Though we have townships all over the country, yet the people do not make towns as in New England, but settle in a scattered way for convenience of farming, and the country grows mighty populous—plantations thick for one hundred miles back. The three lower counties, which make the territories, are mostly plain level land, but the upper counties, which make that part which they call the province, are more uneven all over the country, and abundantly freer of stones than New England. There is not such abundance of barren land as in New England. Almost every where, if you get land, a plantation may be made; though there are some barrens too. The land is light—that they call loom—and is easier of tillage than in New England, though I think I never saw any here so strong and rich as the necks and islands about the bay. [Meaning Boston harbor, then called the bay.] The country is pleasant, and the upper part of it healthy, and abounds with great plenty of all necessary provisions for the life of man and beast.

"As to Oldmixon's history (about which you make inquiry) I never saw

* They had not got enough of strict Scotch Presbyterianism among them, or a rage for reform, else the scene would soon have changed; but they were coming to it now fast; about eleven years more, and the reform of 1741 will come about.

it, and never heard any thing material of it, besides what I find in Doctor Cotton Mather's history of his father's life. There was formerly, when Mr. Penn had newly begun to settle people here, an account published of the country, which I have often seen inserted in histories of America, as well as single, but I have none of them by me.

"The first European inhabitants here were low Dutch and Swedes, who got titles from the Duke of York, which were confirmed by the proprietor, Mr. Penn. There are in this province and the Jerseys, Swedish assemblies —Lutherans. The Ministers come from Sweden, and when they have been here eleven or twelve years they are sent for home, and others sent in their room, for they think it a kind of hardship to be here, and so they call them home and advance them. These Swedish Missionaries are usually men of good learning, and good behavior; they soon learn English, and often preach among church people in vacant places. I have been well acquainted with some of them, and wrote a certificate lately for one that was going home.

"I have not a loadstone in possession now, having lost a good one in removing our goods, to escape a dreadful fire that had like to have turned us out of doors, as it did my next neighbor, the winter before last; but I will endeavor to get one for you—they are found about twenty-two miles off. I was many years ago to search for them and cotton-stones (the amianthus or asbestos) for Mr. Belcher, now your Governor. I had not the opportunity of the conversation with Messrs. Belcher and Oliver which I desired, for which I am much troubled. When they came to my house I unhappily was out of the way; and when I went to look for them, they were pre-engaged, so that I did but just speak to them, which troubles me more than a little; and when I expected them, and waited on purpose, they did not come, being taken up with other company; for the gentry of the town showed them abundance of respect indeed, and, I hear, were exceedingly pleased with them.

"Thus sir, I think I have, in some measure, answered your requests, and shall be glad to understand my account of things has yielded you any satisfaction. If there be any thing that you would be further informed about, touching the state and affairs of this country, I shall readily gratify you as far as I can.

"This, with hearty respects, is all at present from your brother and servant,

"JEDEDIAH ANDREWS.

"To the Rev. THOMAS PRINCE,
"*At Boston, New England.*"

The judicious and inquisitive reader who wishes information upon the subject, will readily excuse the length of this letter, and that it has been given in extenso; for it is justly considered as a precious relic of olden times, and calculated to throw as much light upon the state of society in the infancy of these colonies, and of the true condition and real character of the Mother Presbytery, as any other document now extant.

I shall now make a few comments upon those parts of the letter which relate to the state of American Presbyterianism in that day.

1. Let it be remembered that this letter of Mr. Andrews was written in the year 1730, that is, twenty-five years after the Mother Presbytery had been formed. When the Presbytery was formed the country was very new, and the population sparse and scattered over a great surface, but chiefly confined to the Jerseys, east and west, and to the banks of the Delaware river and bay, and the peninsula of Maryland and Virginia: that is, the population out of which the first congregations of Presbyterians were organized. The upper or inner counties of Pennsylvania were not then settled. We have already inquired respecting the kind of people who first formed those settlements—they were Swedes, low Dutch, New Englanders, emigrants from England, and a mixture of French refugee Protestants. Their religious educations and preferences were Presbyterian, Congregational, Episcopalian, and more lately Quakers. There were in those days few or none of the Irish or Scotch among those early settlers, except a few Scotch merchants and agents, or servants. Emigration from Ireland had not then commenced, or had gone to very little extent, and still less from Scotland. It was not until between 1720 and 1730, that emigrants came from these countries in any number, and they then settled chiefly in the upper or inland parts of Pennsylvania, and from thence more southwardly into Virginia and the Carolinas. We shall furnish authentic documents proving this still more conclusively hereafter. These emigrants were called Scotch Irish, as they are to this day, though they were natives of Ireland. Besides these, there were a number of Palatines, or Germans, who began about the same time to flock to America, who occupied very much the same tract of country with the Irish settlers; but these may be passed by, as they did not amalgamate with others. These were all, in the day in which Andrews's letter was written, called *new-comers*, because people of that class were but lately known in these regions. But the Mother Presbytery had then been in existence from fifteen to twenty-five years, and had acquired a stability and character of its own before these *new-comers* had arrived in the country. These are facts worth noticing, and can all be established by Mr. Andrews's letter, as well as from other sources. As soon as these *new-comers* arrived, and began to mingle in the Presbyterian church with

their peculiar and more rigid and restrictive sentiments, troubles arose which were unknown before, and which grew worse and worse until an open rupture ensued, which we shall hear more about in due time.

2. The actual state of the church in 1730 is learned from this letter with great precision: "Such a multitude of people coming in from Ireland of late years, [from Ireland, not Scotland,] our congregations are multiplied in this province [Pennsylvania, observe, the province, not the territories or lower counties] to the number of fifteen or sixteen, which are all but two or three supplied with Ministers." The Presbytery of Donegal was formed in that region in 1723; that is, they had in that region twelve or thirteen Ministers then settled—"all Scotch or Irish but three or four;" that is, eight or nine Scotch or Irish Ministers in all among these *new-comers*. In the Jerseys the state of things was different. There were some Congregational assemblies who had not fully Presbyterianized, whose inclination was strong toward Congregationalism, being originally of New England, "*but they all submit to the Presbyteries well enough;*" that is, to answer all substantial and peaceful purposes. In the Jerseys, "the Ministers are all Presbyterian, none pretending *to call themselves Congregational*, though mostly from New England." The plain common-sense meaning of this statement is this: In Pennsylvania Scotch and Irish Ministers were the most numerous, and the people were generally the Scotch Irish from Ireland. In the Jerseys the people were generally from New England, and many still had a strong predilection for the kind of government which there prevailed—the Ministers in that region were mostly from New England, but they had all agreed, whatever their preferences might be, to drop the name of Congregational, and *be called Presbyterians;* and that they could all submit and get along with their Presbyteries well enough, as matters had been managed up to that time. They had the year before adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith, in such a manner as satisfied them all very well, but in such a manner as Doctor Green, in his Christian Advocate, says, "*left them nothing of Presbyterianism but the name.*"* (More of this, however, by and by.) But, although they all called themselves Presbyterians, and got along well enough thus far, it was not long to be the case; the Grecian horse had been introduced among them, but it had not yet let out its mischievous inmates.

3. I shall now give Professor Hodge's version of this matter, for he ventures to allude to Mr. Andrews's letter too, and undertakes to draw a strong argument from it, to prove that all the Ministers who were settled in the Jerseys were bona fide strict consistent Presbyterians after the Scottish

* See Christian Advocate, vol. 2, pages 365, 366.

model. Hear him, page 69: "The influence of the New England Puritans was, *as has been seen*, nearly confined [he might have said *altogether*, with as much truth as is to be found in many of his statements] to Long Island and East Jersey. Of those who settled in Jersey a portion were, no doubt, inclined to Congregationalism—others of them were Presbyterians. *All the Ministers*, according to Mr. Andrews, were of the latter class." That is, Presbyterians, without any qualification or limitation. And did not the people from New England also agree to drop the name of Congregationalists and be called Presbyterians as well as the Ministers? Why then make this distinction between the Ministers and people who were from New England, except to make the impression that the Ministers were such Presbyterians as Professor Hodge is pleading for, and then give Mr. Andrews as authority for so saying? Is this candid—is this honest? Why, then, does Doctor Green, Professor Hodge, and others, claim all the original members of the Mother Presbytery as Presbyterians after the rigid Scotch plan, except Mr. Andrews, who they say was a Congregationalist? Did not Andrews call himself a Presbyterian, and agree to drop the name of Congregationalist as well as the rest? If the rest were now good Presbyterians, according to Professor Hodge, why not Mr. Andrews too? Then let us admit they were all good Presbyterians, and I will agree to it likewise. But what sort of Presbyterians were they? I say good American Presbyterians—Professor Hodge says strict consistent Scotch Presbyterians. Now we are apart again as wide as ever.

But we can easily see what kind of Presbyterians these New England Ministers were, and Professor Hodge himself shall tell us in part. See page 43, note: "In 1714, they [the congregation of Woodbridge] invited Mr. John Pierson from Connecticut, who remained with them forty years." "During Mr. Pierson's time, there was no Session in this church. He managed the affairs of this congregation without Elders." Yet this Mr. Pierson was a member of the Mother Presbytery from 1714 to 1754, and was one of those who called himself a Presbyterian, and one to whom Mr. Andrews alludes in his letter, and whom Professor Hodge quotes with so much triumph, while he knew all the facts at the same time. This same Mr. Andrews, who says in his letter, "*we all call ourselves Presbyterians*, none pretending to be called Congregational in *this province*," had no Session nor Elders, but used committee-men all his life; and this continued to be the case in that congregation for sixty years. Yet now, Professor Hodge claims all these New England Ministers as good Presbyterians, and gives Mr. Andrews as good authority. It is really painful for me to have to make such disclosures as these, and to have to make them so often.

Lastly—before I dismiss this letter. If a slight mixture of Congregationalism, such as is found in the Act of Union of 1801, which was designed for new and yet forming congregations, was enough to cause our late reformers to cast all that region of country out of the church without any discrimination, would not the same men, for the same reason, have likewise cast out of the church the Mother Presbytery, and all who sprung from them, for holding such members in its bosom? Let us then have no more eulogies pronounced upon the venerable founders and fathers of our American churches.

CHAPTER III.

Some further account of Mr. Andrews—His intercourse with Makemie—The agency they had in forming the Mother Presbytery—Mr. Andrews loses his high standing and influence toward the close of his life—The kind of Presbyterianism introduced into Scotland at the Reformation—The kind of Presbyterianism commenced in America—Wherein they differed from one another—Extracts from Irvine Spence, Esq.—Some mistakes which Mr. Spence fell into respecting Makemie corrected—Extracts from the Clerks' offices of Accomack county, Virginia, and Somerset county, Maryland—Extracts from the last will and testament of Mr. Anderson, Mr. Makemie's father-in-law—Extracts from Mr. Makemie's last will and testament—Comment upon these documents—Steps taken by Mr. Makemie to supply the desolate districts of country around him with preaching—He takes a voyage to England in the year 1704—Obtains two fellow-laborers from Ireland, Hampton and McNish, who were to be sustained for two years by Dissenting Ministers in and about London—Makemie and his Irish brethren arrive in America in the spring of 1705—Steps taken by Makemie to get them licensed to preach according to the Act of Toleration—Settles them over congregations already organized in Somerset county, on the eastern shore of Maryland—An account of the persecution and imprisonment of Makemie and Hampton in New York—The interesting pamphlet, containing a full report of these trials, providentially preserved, to be printed in the Appendix—An examination of Professor Hodge's argument to prove that all the original members of the Presbytery, except one, were from Scotland or Ireland—Professor Hodge mistakes the character of English Presbyterians—He is set right upon this subject—The character of the original members of the Presbytery, and of their congregations, and where located—A short account of the kind of Presbyterianism adopted by the Mother Presbytery at its formation, &c.

Before proceeding to other matters, this may be as good an opportunity as any to close what it may be thought necessary to say respecting Mr. Andrews. He came to Philadelphia, as will be recollected, about the year 1698, and reduced to order and organized the first Presbyterian church in that city about the year 1701, and died 1747, having served them as their Pastor about forty-eight years. At what time he became acquainted with Mr. Francis Makemie we know not; probably shortly after his settlement in Philadelphia. Mr. Makemie had been an active and successful laborer in the work of the ministry in Accomack county in Virginia, and in the circumjacent regions, since the year 1690—most probably without a solitary ministerial acquaintance or associate until he made an acquaintance with Mr. Andrews. These two brethren formed an intimacy which ripened into a warm friend-

ship for each other, and lasted without interruption until the death of Makemie in the year 1708. We shall see from other documents, and in the last will and testament of Makemie, what tokens of his affectionate regard he left him. Makemie and Andrews were the two master-spirits who formed the plan of commencing a Presbytery and organizing the Presbyterian church in America; and, by their influence over their respective clerical brethren, they effected it. Makemie was decidedly a Presbyterian in his education and preference, but not of the rigid Scotch school. Andrews was raised and educated a Congregationalist, according to the Cambridge Platform, which Professor Hodge says contained all the essential elements of Presbyterianism in it. The Congregationalism of that day was not Independency, or the government of each congregation by its own officers, governing its affairs in connexion with the brotherhood, without connexion with any other Christian society, as we have already seen. The Cambridge Platform admitted the office of Ruling Elder in the church, and most of the churches in that day made use of that office; but as this was a matter of doubtful disputation with many, and not so clearly proved from Scripture as some other points, the churches were left at liberty to use this office or not, as they thought advisable. Those who declined the use of it, supplied the place either by their Deacons, who performed all the duties which others required from Ruling Elders, or by committee-men or assistants, who performed the same duties under another name. Makemie and Andrews came to understand each other's sentiments perfectly, and neither of them attached such consequence to those points wherein they differed as to prevent their uniting together in maintaining what they judged to be essential and fundamental in religion, and to leave each other at liberty in what was considered as non-essentials or mere circumstantials in religion. Makemie induced his Presbyterian neighboring Ministers, who were brought to this country through his influence, to unite in forming a Presbytery upon these liberal principles. Andrews had as much influence over his Congregational brethren from New England, and caused them to yield so far as to drop the name of Congregationalists, to agree to be called Presbyterians, and thus to approximate each other and settle down upon some common principles as fast as they could come to see eye to eye. Makemie had influence enough to secure the name and all the essential principles of Presbyterianism; and the preponderance towards the thorough and consistent Presbyterian system was evident, and increasing without any thing of the rigidity and exclusiveness of the Divine right principles of the Scotch system. All the advantages of the system were secured, as they supposed, without any of its defects or objectionable parts; and in this fraternal intercourse they lived, until Makemie's death, without the least jar or discord to interrupt their harmony.

I shall here anticipate our subject no further than to state, that, after Makemie's death and the increase of Ministers from Ireland and Scotland with their strict and sectarian sentiments, the church, once so united and harmonious, became divided in sentiment, alienated in affection from each other, and was rent asunder by a violent and disgraceful disruption of every Christian tie. Andrews lived till after this schism of 1741; and, contrary to what might have been expected from his early history and practice, identified himself with the old side in zeal for rigid orthodoxy and sectarian bigotry. There was much more coldness and formality among those of that side than vital and fervent piety; and one great cause of the division and contention that brought about the rupture was, friendship and fellowship to the great revival of religion which was commenced and promoted by that wonderful man, the Rev. George Whitfield, on the one hand, and its bitterest revilers and opposers on the other. It is a painful duty to have to say here that Mr. Andrews, a few years before his death, declined most lamentably from that ardent, active discharge of religious duties, by which he had, through the greater part of his life, been distinguished, and disgraced his character by the commission of a crime the most degrading; and although, after professing penitence, he was restored, and allowed to discharge ministerial duties, yet he never recovered from the disgrace which he had brought upon himself, nor regained the confidence of those who had been his most intimate friends and associates. It would have been well for his religious character, and the suffering cause of religion, if he had died a little sooner. As but few persons now living are acquainted with the circumstances of his fall, although circumstantial evidence still exists of the melancholy fact, it would be unnecessary at this day further to disclose this matter. Whether these circumstances induced him to change sides, and identify himself with the old-side party at last, is left to others to form their opinion.

This may be as proper a place as any other to show the difference between the manner in which Presbyterianism was introduced into Scotland, and that in which it commenced in America. This circumstance alone will serve, in a great measure, to account for the character by which the one church differed from the other.

1. In Scotland, Presbyterianism was introduced fresh from Geneva, where it had obtained exclusive possession after Popery had been abolished in that country. There were no other sects or denominations in Switzerland, with their distinctive claims to contend against, but wherever the Reformation prevailed, the system of Calvin bore the undisputed and peaceable sway. The same was the case in Scotland at the commencement of the reformation introduced by Knox and his coadjutors. The field was

their own, and this inspired self-confidence and a determination to keep the undisturbed and entire possession of what they already had. But in America it was far otherwise. The Episcopalians of Virginia, the Congregationalists of New England, the Roman Catholics of Maryland, and the Quakers of Pennsylvania and West Jersey, were all completely organized and in successful operation, as well as in prior possession of their respective territories. The Dutch, and the Swedes, and the Germans, wherever they were found in their neighborhood, in their languages, habits, education, and religion, were aliens to each other, uncompromising and exclusive in character, and rival (and therefore more or less hostile) to any new sect that might spring up among them. The country was new, the population sparse, and those friendly to the Presbyterian mode of worship and order few and far between. They had to form and shape their own materials for use, to look obstacles full in the face, to conciliate friendships, and to make as few enemies as possible. Being few in number, destitute of resources, and struggling with poverty, they were compelled to observe a modest, unobtrusive, conciliating, and inoffensive course, or their cause would have been smothered in the birth. Finding one neighboring sect who agreed entirely with them in doctrine, and in all the essential features of government that could indisputably be proved from Scripture, they would, upon the principles of elective affinity, naturally form associations and friendships with that sect. This intercourse would soon ripen into a desire to assimilate as nearly as possible, to meet upon common ground where there would be no contention, and to combine their efforts against the general and common foe, in support of their common cause and Master. Hence the liberal and catholic principles by which all the acts and proceedings of the Presbytery, in its beginning, were characterized.

2. When the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which had been long established by law and had acquired great property, was superseded in Geneva and Scotland, the Reformers gained over the civil authority in their behalf, and were received under the same patronage and favor the Catholics had formerly enjoyed, besides for the most part coming into possession of their property. Being thus established exclusively by civil government, the Reformers acquired rights which no other sect could claim, and assumed higher pretensions and authority than could belong to any other. It was just the reverse with the Presbyterians in America. In the provinces and territories of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the Jerseys, where the members of the first Presbytery were located, the civil authority was in the hands of Quakers, Roman Catholics, &c. who were disposed, of course, to show especial kindness to their own favorite denominations; and had it not been for the peculiar liberality of the policy adopted by the proprietors of Mary-

land and Pennsylvania, Presbyterians probably never would have had an existence in these United States. But, although they were not disturbed or molested by the civil powers, they were not assisted in the slightest degree, being left to stand or fall by their own exertions, or by the intrinsic excellency of their own principles and forms of government; and commencing their operations under a tolerant government, and deriving such advantages from receiving religious liberty and the right of worshipping according to their own consciences, they were led to incorporate into their church polity a liberality and tolerance never known in Scotland even to the present day.

3. The Reformation under the Presbyterian form was introduced into Scotland by a few clergymen, patronized by the nobility and gentry of the country, who were heartily disgusted at the insolence and avarice of the Papists, and desirous of depriving them of their power and ill-gotten wealth. These clergymen, with the nobles, or chieftains of their clans, took the management of church matters entirely into their own hands—the common people, not being yet affected or reached by the principles of the Reformation, simply obeyed orders, and moved as they were led. The first thing that was done was to call a General Assembly, composed of a few clergymen and nobles and burgesses, who made what changes they pleased in church matters, and formed what regulations they pleased to put down Romanism and erect the Reformation in its place. No Presbyteries, Sessions, or Ruling Elders were yet in existence. The General Assembly was not composed then as it is now, for their church polity had not then been matured or adopted. The political state of the nation was then peculiarly favorable to their plans. The government was in the hands of a Regency, managed by a weak, bigoted, unpopular woman, with the worst advisers, and, the minority continuing for a length of time sufficient for them to mature their plans and fortify themselves against opposition, they assumed high authority and heavy responsibilities upon themselves. The Reformation was undertaken and managed by a General Assembly thus organized, and countenanced by the semblance of a Parliament, such as existed in that day.

Thus was Presbyterianism introduced into Scotland. All power, legislative, judicial, and executive, was assumed as inherent in a General Assembly of this character. They made what changes they pleased—adopted what forms and regulations they thought best; and when they had sufficiently matured their plans, and prepared the people for them, after various modes and regulations had been tried and abandoned, they began to form church Sessions, and Presbyteries, and Provincial Synods, and prescribed the duties, and gave what powers they pleased to each inferior tribunal,

holding them all subordinate and subject to their authority and control. All power originated from and adhered to this General Assembly, and they dealt it out below to their subordinates, or resumed it to themselves as they pleased. Presbyterianism existed nowhere else in this form; it was the creature of circumstances, and the production of necessity. Hitherto, in no other country did Presbyterianism know any thing of such a General Assembly, or of a General Assembly at all. In Geneva, in Holland, in Germany, in France, or wherever Presbyterianism existed, they had their Classes, or Consistories, or Presbyteries; and, besides these, occasional Synods; but of regular annual General Assemblies, with plenipotentiary powers, they knew nothing. This was peculiarly a feature and a distinctive character of rigid Scotch Presbyterianism. They began to build at the top of the house, and worked downwards. It is a manifest misnomer to call it Presbyterianism: it was a new kind of ism under the sun. Presbyterianism is derived from Presbytery, as its basis or root. It is a government by a Presbytery. Neither Synods nor General Assemblies are essential to the Presbyterian system. Power by Divine right, according to the Scriptures, was given to a Presbytery, and not to Synods or General Assemblies; these have no *jure divino* claims at all. The Assembly at Jerusalem, composed by the Apostles and Elders and Brethren convened upon a particular emergency and never repeated, affords a very slender pretext for those kind of conventions, and still less for the authority they have often assumed. But a Scriptural Presbytery has for itself Divine authority, and may claim Scriptural power to itself under the Great Head of the Church, and within its letter of instruction the infallible Word of God. I rejoice to believe that such was the Mother Presbytery formed in Philadelphia in the year 1705; and I am gratified in considering that this is American Presbyterianism. There is no misnomer used here; nor does this pyramid stand upon its apex, but upon a broad Scriptural base as its foundation.

I am well aware that a Presbytery may become so numerous and unwieldy as to be incapable of managing all the affairs of an extended church, in all its departments and dependencies, without a resort to expediencies of different kinds to aid in carrying out and executing its powers and operations. Heaven allows to man a resort to human expediency, and the Scriptures sanction this resort by the church of Christ, within prescribed limits, and subject to a wise control. A Presbytery may adopt human expedients to aid in executing its plans and operations in building up the church of Christ, and superintending its weighty and extensive concerns, and may delegate certain limited and prescribed duties to be performed by bodies of its own creation, subject to its control, whose acts it may sanction, repeal,

change, amend, or modify, as it may judge advisable. Under this control it can impart what power, duty, or privilege it may think would conduce to the peace, purity, and prosperity of the whole body; or it may divide into different Presbyteries, each possessing equal and the same power within its respective limits, yet still preserving the unity and fellowship of the whole. The plan formed, or the constitution adopted, must be by a Presbytery or Presbyteries in connexion—repealable or amendable by them at pleasure. The outline, or platform, of Presbyterianism to be gathered from Scripture, embraces a few plain essential and fundamental principles only, leaving the filling up of the minute details to human expediency and a wise discretion. A Divine right can be pleaded for a few indubitable fundamental principles only. It was left to human sagacity and discretion to adopt the expedients to be employed. This leaves the door open for tolerance and forbearance in lesser matters. In essentials, unity—in non-essentials, liberty—in all things, charity. This I take to be American Presbyterianism in contradistinction to the rigid, exclusive, sectarian Scotch system. Beginning with a Presbytery claiming a Divine right within plain Scripture limits only, and human expedients according to our best judgments in smaller matters, with full liberty of conscience to others to judge for themselves without incurring molestation or civil disabilities for so judging—beginning with a Presbytery, and working upward to Synods when necessary, or to General Assemblies as long as they shall work advantageously, and no longer, as these are not essential to the Presbyterian system—so the Mother Presbytery, after awhile, resorted to the expedient of a Synod, and afterwards to a General Assembly, to be kept within the prescribed limits of a written constitution, formed for their rule and subject to such changes and amendments as Presbyteries, from time to time, shall judge necessary. Under such a government it arose and spread its branches far and wide, and covered the hills.

Having thus hastily given a brief sketch of the kind of government that constituted American Presbyterianism, and wherein it differed from the Scottish system, before proceeding to give an account of the formation of the Presbytery, at what time it was organized, and the members composing it, it will be necessary to give a fuller account of the most distinguished father of this Presbytery (the Rev. Francis Makemie) than we have yet had an opportunity of doing. It is to be lamented that a person of such distinguished piety, talents, and usefulness, should be so little known even by Presbyterians themselves, and that so few documents are left to rescue his name and works from the oblivion into which they had almost fallen. A few records from clerks' offices, and an old pamphlet or two, are all that have been fallen upon, in addition to the minutes and letters of the Presbytery already published.

The Rev. Francis Makemie was a native of Ireland, but of the time of his birth, or respecting his parents, we can gather no information at all. He was a man of finished education, but where he was educated, or under whose instruction, we are not apprised. He appears to have been a good classical scholar—a sound and profound theologian. There is reason to believe he had, at some period, studied law with great care, and reports have got into circulation that he practised law, as well as preached the Gospel, while he lived in Accomack county, in Virginia. But after a diligent search of the records in the clerk's office of that county, there can be found not the slightest evidence that this was the case, and evidence would certainly have been there if it had been so; so we may confidently assert there was no foundation for that report. Mr. Irvine Spence seems to think that he served as a magistrate in that county for a number of years, but this also must be a mistake, for in those days no Dissenter in Virginia was allowed to fill such an office. I shall, however, forbear giving his character any further, until I give extracts and documents that will prepare the reader to credit my subsequent statements respecting this extraordinary man.

The extracts now to be given are taken from "Letters on the early history of the Presbyterian Church in America," by Irvine Spence, Esquire, a pious lawyer, and Elder of a church on the eastern shore of Maryland, published at Philadelphia, by Henry Perkins in 1838—a work that is well worth reading. To avoid prolixity, I shall not always extract verbatim; when I do so, I will use quotation marks. At other times I shall condense his account of matters, omitting such things as may not be relevant to our subject.

Letter 7th, page 69: "In my last letter [says he] I alluded to Mr. Makemie's travels. He appears not only to have been much attached to the Rev. Mr. Andrews of Philadelphia, but familiar with the people of his charge. He visited New York, New England, and the West Indies, but how frequently I know not. But the persecution which he suffered from the bigotry of the universally detested Lord Carnbury, Governor of New York, proved that he used those journeys for the good of souls. He must also have preached in the island of Barbadoes, for he there complied with the terms of the Toleration Act, which he could have done for no other purpose but to qualify himself to preach as a Dissenter.

"In the summer of 1704 he went to Europe, where it seems he remained till the autumn of the succeeding year. The year before (1703) he had contemplated a voyage to England, and made arrangements for so doing, but was prevented from accomplishing it. In Ireland he had near relations, two brothers and two sisters, if no more." "From the character of the man, this visit no doubt had relation to the interests of the infant churches which

he had left behind him. This conjecture has strong support. Shortly after his return to Virginia, indeed so shortly that they might have crossed the ocean in the same vessel that brought him, two Presbyterian clergymen [Hampton and McNish] from Ireland had arrived, and were laboring among those churches noticed in my sixth letter."

"Mr. Makemie was a bold man, and it would seem that he was willing to endure all things for the Elect's sake, that he might obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus, with eternal glory. I have alluded to the persecution which he suffered in New York. He reached that city in the month of January, 1707; from the season of the year, we conclude certainly that he made the journey by land and not coastwise, and from the missionary spirit of the man, there is no doubt he preached the truth all along the way. He was accompanied by the Rev. John Hampton, the settled Pastor of Snowhill. There were at that time in New York Dutch and French Calvinists, Episcopalians, and Irish Presbyterians. The Presbyterians had neither meeting-house nor Minister. *Messrs. Makemie and Hampton had, with the consent of the congregation or their representatives, preached once, perhaps many times, in the Dutch church.* [It will appear hereafter, from Mr. Makemie's own statement, which Mr. Spence had not seen, that the latter was mistaken here—for after obtaining leave of that congregation to preach in their church, Lord Carnbury prevented his preaching there.] On a particular Sabbath day, Mr. Makemie preached a sermon in a private house, with open doors, and Mr. Hampton preached at the same time at Newtown, Long Island," &c. for which they were both arrested next day and imprisoned, as will be stated more at large hereafter.

Spence's 9th letter, page 75: "I have not done with Mr. Francis Makemie, and am the more unwilling to quit his name because so few of the members of the Presbyterian church in the United States know any thing about him, and because *my knowledge* of the man; his character, his conduct, his labors of love, will soon be consigned to a house in which there is neither available knowledge nor wisdom. Instead of living upon the church, or receiving a revenue from the contribution of its members, he (largely) supplied the temporal wants of the church from his own resources. Indeed, the whole church was dear to him; for the first church in Philadelphia, and for its Pastor, he discovered a deep interest."

Page 76: "I have already referred to Mr. Makemie's disinterested labors, his benevolence, his strong Presbyterian predilections, and that, instead of deriving temporal advantages from the church, he was in temporal, as well as in spiritual things, the church's benefactor. The meeting-house at Rehoboth, (at the west side of the mouth of Pocomoke river,) in which worshipped the congregation that appears to have been the Benjamin of his

Lastly—before I dismiss this letter. If a slight mixture of Congregationalism, such as is found in the Act of Union of 1801, which was designed for new and yet forming congregations, was enough to cause our late reformers to cast all that region of country out of the church without any discrimination, would not the same men, for the same reason, have likewise cast out of the church the Mother Presbytery, and all who sprung from them, for holding such members in its bosom? Let us then have no more eulogies pronounced upon the venerable founders and fathers of our American churches.

CHAPTER III.

Some further account of Mr. Andrews—His intercourse with Makemie—The agency they had in forming the Mother Presbytery—Mr. Andrews loses his high standing and influence toward the close of his life—The kind of Presbyterianism introduced into Scotland at the Reformation—The kind of Presbyterianism commenced in America—Wherein they differed from one another—Extracts from Irvine Spence, Esq.—Some mistakes which Mr. Spence fell into respecting Makemie corrected—Extracts from the Clerks' offices of Accomack county, Virginia, and Somerset county, Maryland—Extracts from the last will and testament of Mr. Anderson, Mr. Makemie's father-in-law—Extracts from Mr. Makemie's last will and testament—Comment upon these documents—Steps taken by Mr. Makemie to supply the desolate districts of country around him with preaching—He takes a voyage to England in the year 1704—Obtains two fellow-laborers from Ireland, Hampton and McNish, who were to be sustained for two years by Dissenting Ministers in and about London—Makemie and his Irish brethren arrive in America in the spring of 1705—Steps taken by Makemie to get them licensed to preach according to the Act of Toleration—Settles them over congregations already organized in Somerset county, on the eastern shore of Maryland—An account of the persecution and imprisonment of Makemie and Hampton in New York—The interesting pamphlet, containing a full report of these trials, providentially preserved, to be printed in the Appendix—An examination of Professor Hodge's argument to prove that all the original members of the Presbytery, except one, were from Scotland or Ireland—Professor Hodge mistakes the character of English Presbyterians—He is set right upon this subject—The character of the original members of the Presbytery, and of their congregations, and where located—A short account of the kind of Presbyterianism adopted by the Mother Presbytery at its formation, &c.

Before proceeding to other matters, this may be as good an opportunity as any to close what it may be thought necessary to say respecting Mr. Andrews. He came to Philadelphia, as will be recollected, about the year 1698, and reduced to order and organized the first Presbyterian church in that city about the year 1701, and died 1747, having served them as their Pastor about forty-eight years. At what time he became acquainted with Mr. Francis Makemie we know not; probably shortly after his settlement in Philadelphia. Mr. Makemie had been an active and successful laborer in the work of the ministry in Accomack county in Virginia, and in the circumjacent regions, since the year 1690—most probably without a solitary ministerial acquaintance or associate until he made an acquaintance with Mr. Andrews. These two brethren formed an intimacy which ripened into a warm friend-

ship for each other, and lasted without interruption until the death of Makemie in the year 1708. We shall see from other documents, and in the last will and testament of Makemie, what tokens of his affectionate regard he left him. Makemie and Andrews were the two master-spirits who formed the plan of commencing a Presbytery and organizing the Presbyterian church in America; and, by their influence over their respective clerical brethren, they effected it. Makemie was decidedly a Presbyterian in his education and preference, but not of the rigid Scotch school. Andrews was raised and educated a Congregationalist, according to the Cambridge Platform, which Professor Hodge says contained all the essential elements of Presbyterianism in it. The Congregationalism of that day was not Independency, or the government of each congregation by its own officers, governing its affairs in connexion with the brotherhood, without connexion with any other Christian society, as we have already seen. The Cambridge Platform admitted the office of Ruling Elder in the church, and most of the churches in that day made use of that office; but as this was a matter of doubtful disputation with many, and not so clearly proved from Scripture as some other points, the churches were left at liberty to use this office or not, as they thought advisable. Those who declined the use of it, supplied the place either by their Deacons, who performed all the duties which others required from Ruling Elders, or by committee-men or assistants, who performed the same duties under another name. Makemie and Andrews came to understand each other's sentiments perfectly, and neither of them attached such consequence to those points wherein they differed as to prevent their uniting together in maintaining what they judged to be essential and fundamental in religion, and to leave each other at liberty in what was considered as non-essentials or mere circumstantials in religion. Makemie induced his Presbyterian neighboring Ministers, who were brought to this country through his influence, to unite in forming a Presbytery upon these liberal principles. Andrews had as much influence over his Congregational brethren from New England, and caused them to yield so far as to drop the name of Congregationalists, to agree to be called Presbyterians, and thus to approximate each other and settle down upon some common principles as fast as they could come to see eye to eye. Makemie had influence enough to secure the name and all the essential principles of Presbyterianism; and the preponderance towards the thorough and consistent Presbyterian system was evident, and increasing without any thing of the rigidity and exclusiveness of the Divine right principles of the Scotch system. All the advantages of the system were secured, as they supposed, without any of its defects or objectionable parts; and in this fraternal intercourse they lived, until Makemie's death, without the least jar or discord to interrupt their harmony.

I shall here anticipate our subject no further than to state, that, after Makemie's death and the increase of Ministers from Ireland and Scotland with their strict and sectarian sentiments, the church, once so united and harmonious, became divided in sentiment, alienated in affection from each other, and was rent asunder by a violent and disgraceful disruption of every Christian tie. Andrews lived till after this schism of 1741; and, contrary to what might have been expected from his early history and practice, identified himself with the old side in zeal for rigid orthodoxy and sectarian bigotry. There was much more coldness and formality among those of that side than vital and fervent piety; and one great cause of the division and contention that brought about the rupture was, friendship and fellowship to the great revival of religion which was commenced and promoted by that wonderful man, the Rev. George Whitfield, on the one hand, and its bitterest revilers and opposers on the other. It is a painful duty to have to say here that Mr. Andrews, a few years before his death, declined most lamentably from that ardent, active discharge of religious duties, by which he had, through the greater part of his life, been distinguished, and disgraced his character by the commission of a crime the most degrading; and although, after professing penitence, he was restored, and allowed to discharge ministerial duties, yet he never recovered from the disgrace which he had brought upon himself, nor regained the confidence of those who had been his most intimate friends and associates. It would have been well for his religious character, and the suffering cause of religion, if he had died a little sooner. As but few persons now living are acquainted with the circumstances of his fall, although circumstantial evidence still exists of the melancholy fact, it would be unnecessary at this day further to disclose this matter. Whether these circumstances induced him to change sides, and identify himself with the old-side party at last, is left to others to form their opinion.

This may be as proper a place as any other to show the difference between the manner in which Presbyterianism was introduced into Scotland, and that in which it commenced in America. This circumstance alone will serve, in a great measure, to account for the character by which the one church differed from the other.

1. In Scotland, Presbyterianism was introduced fresh from Geneva, where it had obtained exclusive possession after Popery had been abolished in that country. There were no other sects or denominations in Switzerland, with their distinctive claims to contend against, but wherever the Reformation prevailed, the system of Calvin bore the undisputed and peaceable sway. The same was the case in Scotland at the commencement of the reformation introduced by Knox and his coadjutors. The field was

their own, and this inspired self-confidence and a determination to keep the undisturbed and entire possession of what they already had. But in America it was far otherwise. The Episcopalians of Virginia, the Congregationalists of New England, the Roman Catholics of Maryland, and the Quakers of Pennsylvania and West Jersey, were all completely organized and in successful operation, as well as in prior possession of their respective territories. The Dutch, and the Swedes, and the Germans, wherever they were found in their neighborhood, in their languages, habits, education, and religion, were aliens to each other, uncompromising and exclusive in character, and rival (and therefore more or less hostile) to any new sect that might spring up among them. The country was new, the population sparse, and those friendly to the Presbyterian mode of worship and order few and far between. They had to form and shape their own materials for use, to look obstacles full in the face, to conciliate friendships, and to make as few enemies as possible. Being few in number, destitute of resources, and struggling with poverty, they were compelled to observe a modest, unobtrusive, conciliating, and inoffensive course, or their cause would have been smothered in the birth. Finding one neighboring sect who agreed entirely with them in doctrine, and in all the essential features of government that could indisputably be proved from Scripture, they would, upon the principles of elective affinity, naturally form associations and friendships with that sect. This intercourse would soon ripen into a desire to assimilate as nearly as possible, to meet upon common ground where there would be no contention, and to combine their efforts against the general and common foe, in support of their common cause and Master. Hence the liberal and catholic principles by which all the acts and proceedings of the Presbytery, in its beginning, were characterized.

2. When the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which had been long established by law and had acquired great property, was superseded in Geneva and Scotland, the Reformers gained over the civil authority in their behalf, and were received under the same patronage and favor the Catholics had formerly enjoyed, besides for the most part coming into possession of their property. Being thus established exclusively by civil government, the Reformers acquired rights which no other sect could claim, and assumed higher pretensions and authority than could belong to any other. It was just the reverse with the Presbyterians in America. In the provinces and territories of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the Jerseys, where the members of the first Presbytery were located, the civil authority was in the hands of Quakers, Roman Catholics, &c. who were disposed, of course, to show especial kindness to their own favorite denominations; and had it not been for the peculiar liberality of the policy adopted by the proprietors of Mary-

land and Pennsylvania, Presbyterians probably never would have had an existence in these United States. But, although they were not disturbed or molested by the civil powers, they were not assisted in the slightest degree, being left to stand or fall by their own exertions, or by the intrinsic excellency of their own principles and forms of government; and commencing their operations under a tolerant government, and deriving such advantages from receiving religious liberty and the right of worshipping according to their own consciences, they were led to incorporate into their church polity a liberality and tolerance never known in Scotland even to the present day.

3. The Reformation under the Presbyterian form was introduced into Scotland by a few clergymen, patronized by the nobility and gentry of the country, who were heartily disgusted at the insolence and avarice of the Papists, and desirous of depriving them of their power and ill-gotten wealth. These clergymen, with the nobles, or chieftains of their clans, took the management of church matters entirely into their own hands—the common people, not being yet affected or reached by the principles of the Reformation, simply obeyed orders, and moved as they were led. The first thing that was done was to call a General Assembly, composed of a few clergymen and nobles and burgesses, who made what changes they pleased in church matters, and formed what regulations they pleased to put down Romanism and erect the Reformation in its place. No Presbyteries, Sessions, or Ruling Elders were yet in existence. The General Assembly was not composed then as it is now, for their church polity had not then been matured or adopted. The political state of the nation was then peculiarly favorable to their plans. The government was in the hands of a Regency, managed by a weak, bigoted, unpopular woman, with the worst advisers, and, the minority continuing for a length of time sufficient for them to mature their plans and fortify themselves against opposition, they assumed high authority and heavy responsibilities upon themselves. The Reformation was undertaken and managed by a General Assembly thus organized, and countenanced by the semblance of a Parliament, such as existed in that day.

Thus was Presbyterianism introduced into Scotland. All power, legislative, judicial, and executive, was assumed as inherent in a General Assembly of this character. They made what changes they pleased—adopted what forms and regulations they thought best; and when they had sufficiently matured their plans, and prepared the people for them, after various modes and regulations had been tried and abandoned, they began to form church Sessions, and Presbyteries, and Provincial Synods, and prescribed the duties, and gave what powers they pleased to each inferior tribunal,

holding them all subordinate and subject to their authority and control. All power originated from and adhered to this General Assembly, and they dealt it out below to their subordinates, or resumed it to themselves as they pleased. Presbyterianism existed nowhere else in this form; it was the creature of circumstances, and the production of necessity. Hitherto, in no other country did Presbyterianism know any thing of such a General Assembly, or of a General Assembly at all. In Geneva, in Holland, in Germany, in France, or wherever Presbyterianism existed, they had their Classes, or Consistories, or Presbyteries; and, besides these, occasional Synods; but of regular annual General Assemblies, with plenipotentiary powers, they knew nothing. This was peculiarly a feature and a distinctive character of rigid Scotch Presbyterianism. They began to build at the top of the house, and worked downwards. It is a manifest misnomer to call it Presbyterianism: it was a new kind of ism under the sun. Presbyterianism is derived from Presbytery, as its basis or root. It is a government by a Presbytery. Neither Synods nor General Assemblies are essential to the Presbyterian system. Power by Divine right, according to the Scriptures, was given to a Presbytery, and not to Synods or General Assemblies; these have no *jure divino* claims at all. The Assembly at Jerusalem, composed by the Apostles and Elders and Brethren convened upon a particular emergency and never repeated, affords a very slender pretext for those kind of conventions, and still less for the authority they have often assumed. But a Scriptural Presbytery has for itself Divine authority, and may claim Scriptural power to itself under the Great Head of the Church, and within its letter of instruction the infallible Word of God. I rejoice to believe that such was the Mother Presbytery formed in Philadelphia in the year 1705; and I am gratified in considering that this is American Presbyterianism. There is no misnomer used here; nor does this pyramid stand upon its apex, but upon a broad Scriptural base as its foundation.

I am well aware that a Presbytery may become so numerous and unwieldy as to be incapable of managing all the affairs of an extended church, in all its departments and dependencies, without a resort to expediencies of different kinds to aid in carrying out and executing its powers and operations. Heaven allows to man a resort to human expediency, and the Scriptures sanction this resort by the church of Christ, within prescribed limits, and subject to a wise control. A Presbytery may adopt human expedients to aid in executing its plans and operations in building up the church of Christ, and superintending its weighty and extensive concerns, and may delegate certain limited and prescribed duties to be performed by bodies of its own creation, subject to its control, whose acts it may sanction, repeal,

change, amend, or modify, as it may judge advisable. Under this control it can impart what power, duty, or privilege it may think would conduce to the peace, purity, and prosperity of the whole body; or it may divide into different Presbyteries, each possessing equal and the same power within its respective limits, yet still preserving the unity and fellowship of the whole. The plan formed, or the constitution adopted, must be by a Presbytery or Presbyteries in connexion—repealable or amendable by them at pleasure. The outline, or platform, of Presbyterianism to be gathered from Scripture, embraces a few plain essential and fundamental principles only, leaving the filling up of the minute details to human expediency and a wise discretion. A Divine right can be pleaded for a few indubitable fundamental principles only. It was left to human sagacity and discretion to adopt the expedients to be employed. This leaves the door open for tolerance and forbearance in lesser matters. In essentials, unity—in non-essentials, liberty—in all things, charity. This I take to be American Presbyterianism in contradistinction to the rigid, exclusive, sectarian Scotch system. Beginning with a Presbytery claiming a Divine right within plain Scripture limits only, and human expedients according to our best judgments in smaller matters, with full liberty of conscience to others to judge for themselves without incurring molestation or civil disabilities for so judging—beginning with a Presbytery, and working upward to Synods when necessary, or to General Assemblies as long as they shall work advantageously, and no longer, as these are not essential to the Presbyterian system—so the Mother Presbytery, after awhile, resorted to the expedient of a Synod, and afterwards to a General Assembly, to be kept within the prescribed limits of a written constitution, formed for their rule and subject to such changes and amendments as Presbyteries, from time to time, shall judge necessary. Under such a government it arose and spread its branches far and wide, and covered the hills.

Having thus hastily given a brief sketch of the kind of government that constituted American Presbyterianism, and wherein it differed from the Scottish system, before proceeding to give an account of the formation of the Presbytery, at what time it was organized, and the members composing it, it will be necessary to give a fuller account of the most distinguished father of this Presbytery (the Rev. Francis Makemie) than we have yet had an opportunity of doing. It is to be lamented that a person of such distinguished piety, talents, and usefulness, should be so little known even by Presbyterians themselves, and that so few documents are left to rescue his name and works from the oblivion into which they had almost fallen. A few records from clerks' offices, and an old pamphlet or two, are all that have been fallen upon, in addition to the minutes and letters of the Presbytery already published.

The Rev. Francis Makemie was a native of Ireland, but of the time of his birth, or respecting his parents, we can gather no information at all. He was a man of finished education, but where he was educated, or under whose instruction, we are not apprised. He appears to have been a good classical scholar—a sound and profound theologian. There is reason to believe he had, at some period, studied law with great care, and reports have got into circulation that he practised law, as well as preached the Gospel, while he lived in Accomack county, in Virginia. But after a diligent search of the records in the clerk's office of that county, there can be found not the slightest evidence that this was the case, and evidence would certainly have been there if it had been so; so we may confidently assert there was no foundation for that report. Mr. Irvine Spence seems to think that he served as a magistrate in that county for a number of years, but this also must be a mistake, for in those days no Dissenter in Virginia was allowed to fill such an office. I shall, however, forbear giving his character any further, until I give extracts and documents that will prepare the reader to credit my subsequent statements respecting this extraordinary man.

The extracts now to be given are taken from "Letters on the early history of the Presbyterian Church in America," by Irvine Spence, Esquire, a pious lawyer, and Elder of a church on the eastern shore of Maryland, published at Philadelphia, by Henry Perkins in 1838—a work that is well worth reading. To avoid prolixity, I shall not always extract verbatim; when I do so, I will use quotation marks. At other times I shall condense his account of matters, omitting such things as may not be relevant to our subject.

Letter 7th, page 69: "In my last letter [says he] I alluded to Mr. Makemie's travels. He appears not only to have been much attached to the Rev. Mr. Andrews of Philadelphia, but familiar with the people of his charge. He visited New York, New England, and the West Indies, but how frequently I know not. But the persecution which he suffered from the bigotry of the universally detested Lord Carnbury, Governor of New York, proved that he used those journeys for the good of souls. He must also have preached in the island of Barbadoes, for he there complied with the terms of the Toleration Act, which he could have done for no other purpose but to qualify himself to preach as a Dissenter.

"In the summer of 1704 he went to Europe, where it seems he remained till the autumn of the succeeding year. The year before (1703) he had contemplated a voyage to England, and made arrangements for so doing, but was prevented from accomplishing it. In Ireland he had near relations, two brothers and two sisters, if no more." "From the character of the man, this visit no doubt had relation to the interests of the infant churches which

he had left behind him. This conjecture has strong support. Shortly after his return to Virginia, indeed so shortly that they might have crossed the ocean in the same vessel that brought him, two Presbyterian clergymen [Hampton and McNish] from Ireland had arrived, and were laboring among those churches noticed in my sixth letter."

"Mr. Makemie was a bold man, and it would seem that he was willing to endure all things for the Elect's sake, that he might obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus, with eternal glory. I have alluded to the persecution which he suffered in New York. He reached that city in the month of January, 1707; from the season of the year, we conclude certainly that he made the journey by land and not coastwise, and from the missionary spirit of the man, there is no doubt he preached the truth all along the way. He was accompanied by the Rev. John Hampton, the settled Pastor of Snowhill. There were at that time in New York Dutch and French Calvinists, Episcopalians, and Irish Presbyterians. The Presbyterians had neither meeting-house nor Minister. *Messrs. Makemie and Hampton had, with the consent of the congregation or their representatives, preached once, perhaps many times, in the Dutch church.* [It will appear hereafter, from Mr. Makemie's own statement, which Mr. Spence had not seen, that the latter was mistaken here,—for after obtaining leave of that congregation to preach in their church, Lord Carnbury prevented his preaching there.] On a particular Sabbath day, Mr. Makemie preached a sermon in a private house, with open doors, and Mr. Hampton preached at the same time at Newtown, Long Island," &c. for which they were both arrested next day and imprisoned, as will be stated more at large hereafter.

Spence's 9th letter, page 75: "I have not done with Mr. Francis Makemie, and am the more unwilling to quit his name because so few of the members of the Presbyterian church in the United States know any thing about him, and because *my knowledge* of the man, his character, his conduct, his labors of love, will soon be consigned to a house in which there is neither available knowledge nor wisdom. Instead of living upon the church, or receiving a revenue from the contribution of its members, he (largely) supplied the temporal wants of the church from his own resources. Indeed, the whole church was dear to him; for the first church in Philadelphia, and for its Pastor, he discovered a deep interest."

Page 76: "I have already referred to Mr. Makemie's disinterested labors, his benevolence, his strong Presbyterian predilections, and that, instead of deriving temporal advantages from the church, he was in temporal, as well as in spiritual things, the church's benefactor. The meeting-house at Rehoboth, (at the west side of the mouth of Pocomoke river,) in which worshipped the congregation that appears to have been the Benjamin of his

latter days, was erected upon his own land, and provision is made by his will for the conveyance of the lot of ground in perpetuity, to be used [exclusively] as a Presbyterian house of worship."

Letter 10, page 79: "For a long time after his settlement in Virginia, Dissenters were not permitted to preach within her limits on any terms; and although Mr. Makemie had become domiciliated there anterior to the year 1690, yet he was not authorized to preach there until October 15th, 1699. He must have been ordained in Europe—I believe by the Presbytery of Donegal, Ireland. Would such a man and such a Minister have remained quietly at home, and kept silence for ten, or twenty, or, for aught we know, for thirty years, by laws more cruel than those which he had left behind him? Tradition, common sense, and authenticated facts, seal the conclusion that it is impossible he could have *so* spent so many years of his life. But where did he execute the duties of his office, in which he was initiated by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery? The answer is at hand. By travelling over a level country a few miles, he would be beyond the reach of the laws and constituted authorities of Virginia."

As I feel confident that the excellent writer, Mr. Spence, from whom I quote these extracts, and to whom the Presbyterian church is much indebted, was mistaken, and drew wrong conclusions respecting Mr. Makemie's labors, I shall make a few observations to try to set this matter right.

1. Mr. Spence supposes that Mr. Makemie must have been actively engaged in ministerial labors for many years—say ten, twenty, or probably thirty years—before he settled in Accomack, early in 1690, and before he began to preach in Virginia in 1699. This he infers from the amount of labor that was performed, and the good that had been done by his labors alone, before the year 1699, when he supposed he began for the first time to preach in Virginia. Mr. Makemie settled in Accomack in 1690—probably about the close of the year 1689, for I think there is one entry on the records of that county in which he is mentioned about the end of the year 1689—none sooner, but many afterwards. But, if Mr. Spence had seen the early letters published by the Mother Presbytery, he would have found that some Presbyterian Minister had been preaching pretty extensively through Virginia, on the other side of the Chesapeake bay, about where Norfolk now stands, upon Elizabeth river, and about York and Rappahannock rivers, and had left tracks behind him in all these places; for Presbyterians were found in all this region round about; and that Mr. Makemie possessed a dwelling-house and lot both on Elizabeth river and at Urbana, on Rappahannock river, when he died; at which time there was an organized Presbyterian church at Elizabeth river, which was served by a Mr. Macky, an Irish Minister, as their Pastor, shortly after Makemie's

death—the laws of Virginia to the contrary notwithstanding. These facts were unknown to Mr. Spence; so that he was quite mistaken in supposing Mr. Makemie had never preached in Virginia before he obtained permission of the Court of Accomack in 1699.) There can be no doubt but he had preached extensively in different parts of Virginia, and in the island of Barbadoes also, as well as in Maryland, before the period alluded to. This was, no doubt, done at the hazard of his liberty and life; but *he was the man* that could dare dangers and face difficulties of the kind. And there is no cause to doubt but he had commenced operations in Virginia and got matters in train when last in London and Ireland, for Macky's settlement on Elizabeth river, as well as Henry's becoming his immediate successor in Rehoboth after his death, go far to prove this. Henry and Macky appear to have been intimate friends, as the Presbyterial records show, and probably came out together from Ireland under the patronage of the London Ministers about the time Makemie died, as Hampton and McNish had done three years before; for, by an arrangement with the London Brethren, they were to send two at a time, with an interval of about two years between each mission.

But it may be thought that this will only increase the difficulty of that worthy man, Mr. Spence, by ascribing still more labor to the apostolical Makemie, and allowing him shorter time. It is true, it would appear almost incredible, if we were to come to the conclusion by comparing him with such common men as we are, in those days; but when we recollect what that other father of Presbyterianism in Virginia, the Rev. Samuel Davies, effected at the second era of the same church in Virginia, within the space of eight or ten years of his labors in that State, we shall not be so incredulous; for such was the readiness of the oppressed inhabitants of that State to receive the Gospel, when preached in simplicity and faithfulness —so different from what they had been accustomed to—and such were the untiring zeal and indefatigable efforts of the immortal Davies, that in about the same time (that is, nine or ten years) he organized more churches than we ascribe to Makemie, got them generally supplied with Ministers, and occupied a greater extent of territory. There is no telling what one man of the true primitive and apostolical stamp may effect by God's smiles and assistance in so short time, "*when he has a heart to the work.*"

2. That Mr. Spence was also mistaken in supposing that Makemie had been laboring in Maryland twenty or thirty years before he commenced in Virginia, let the following calculation be attended to. We can hardly suppose he came out from London at first, to undertake his arduous enterprise of evangelizing the destitute colonies of America, before he was [illegible] thirty years of age. He settled in Accomack in 1690. If [illegible]

twenty when he came out, he would have been then fifty years old; if thirty years, he would then have been sixty. He died in 1708; so that he must have been either sixty-eight or seventy-eight years old when he died; yet, at the time of his death, he had been married but a few years, and his two daughters were young minors. In the year 1698, when Mr. Anderson, his father-in-law, died, Mrs. Makemie had then no child, so that her eldest daughter could only have been ten years old when Makemie her father died. The good Mr. Spence, in his zeal to claim for his beloved native State of Maryland, with her free institutions, the credit of being the *faderland* of Presbyterianism, has like many a good man *calculated without his host*. But suppose that he settled at Accomack as soon as he came out, and, if then thirty years old, he would have been forty-eight years old at his death; for he died when he was yet in the midst of his labors and usefulness. Like his successor in Virginia, President Davies, who died when only thirty-seven years old, he lived fast, and did much in little time.

3. It is a matter of but little importance which was the first Presbyterian church organized in America: there could be but little difference between those formed in Virginia and those in Maryland; but as there were fewer difficulties from the civil authorities to be encountered in Maryland than in Virginia, and the people could enjoy the stated and regular ministrations of the Gospel with much less interruption in the former than in the latter colony, it is highly probable that the congregations in Maryland were brought to order sooner than those in Virginia, and were more regularly supplied with the ordinances of the Gospel. The first church in Philadelphia was organized in its own way much about the same time.

Mr. Spence, page 81, says further of Makemie: "Do you ask for evidence of any connexion between the church of Snowhill and Makemie? I doubt whether the name of any Gospel Minister was ever held in higher honor, by an American congregation, than was that of Makemie by the people of Snowhill. His praises have not yet left the church, although he has rested from his labors almost one hundred and thirty years. Tradition has made a record of his labors and many excellencies of character; one generation has uttered his praise in the ears of its successor, and you may even yet hear their echo. Parents made his surname the christian-name of their children, until, in the neighborhood of Snowhill, it has become a common one. The church has had no Pastor, from 1708 until this time, whose name it so profoundly venerates. Information derived from aged lips, which it was once my pleasure to listen to, and my duty to honor, produces peculiar feelings whenever I hear the name of Francis Makemie. Further proof of Mr. Makemie's connexion with the church in Snowhill, and, indeed, with all the other churches in Somerset, is de-

rived from the fact, that these churches were organized when there was no other Presbyterian Minister on the continent to effect their organization. There is record evidence of the fact, that there were five church edifices, and as many organized Presbyterian congregations, in Somerset county, (as it then was, but since divided and Worcester county taken off,) on the 13th day of March, 1705, and neither popular tradition nor public nor private documents know any thing of any Presbyterian Clergyman, within the bounds of the existing Presbytery of Lewis, at this time, excepting Francis Makemie." "And if Mr. Makemie did not organize those churches, and preach to them, who did? He had been the only Minister of that persuasion on the continent; and from some time in the summer of 1704 until the autumn of 1705, he had been in Europe." Letter 11, page 87: "Forasmuch as the license to Messrs. Hampton and M'Nish, by the Governor, to preach in four distinct meeting houses, bears date March, 1705,* is not the conclusion strong and irresistible, that the Gospel had been preached by Ministers of our denomination for several years before that date? It is well known that, anterior to that time, this part of the country was but thinly settled—that the people were poor, and the times peculiarly oppressive on Presbyterians. As they were compelled to support the Episcopal church, which was then established in the colony, as well as their own, and money being very scarce, it was not probable they could have had the means of building four churches, three of which are within fifteen miles of each other, in two, three, four, or five years immediately anterior to 1705, and early, too, in that year?"

Page 89: "I am aware [says Mr. Spence] that the Rev. Mr. Andrews took charge of the church in Philadelphia in 1701. He, I believe, was a Congregationalist. I think the will of Mr. Makemie shows that he died in doubt whether the congregation now denominated the First Church in Philadelphia would be Presbyterian or Independent in its government.† His will says, in relation to it: '*I give and bequeath said library to such Minister as shall succeed him,* [*Mr. Andrews,*] *and to such only as shall be of the Presbyterian or Independent persuasion, and none else.*' Compare this extract with the following language, used in relation to the church at Rehoboth: 'I order and empower my executrix to sell, dispose of, and alien also my lot, adjoining the new meeting-house lot in Pocomoke town, called Rehoboth, empowering my executrix to make over and alienate that lot on which the meeting house is built in as ample manner, to all intents and purposes, as shall be required for the

* This will shortly be proved by authentic documents.

† Mr. Makemie's will will be given at large by-and-bye.

ends and uses of a Presbyterian congregation, as if I were personally present, and to their successors forever, *and to none else but to such of the same persuasion in matters of religion.*' As to the church in Philadelphia, he was willing it should enjoy his liberality, whether it assumed decidedly the Presbyterian or Independent form of government; but about the church in Rehoboth, which he had planted, watered, and endowed, he felt no such uncertainty, and therefore he permits no option as to the religious name of the persons who should be benefitted by the devise."

Page 92: "The fact that Mr. Andrews was a member of the first Presbytery organized in the colonies, affords no proof that either he or his people were Presbyterian in their predilections. If there were not more than half a dozen Presbyterians and Independent Ministers between the southern boundary of New York and Terra del Fuego, I think they would willingly meet in an ecclesiastical court, whether called Classis, Council, Convention, Conference, Association, Consociation, or Presbytery."

Thus far I have quoted literally from Mr. Spence. I shall now give condensed accounts of what may be gathered from his researches, without always using his very language, or even the order of statements.

He supposes that Rehoboth, a congregation near the mouth of Pocomoke, was the oldest and the most beloved of all the congregations organized by Mr. Makemie. It lay on the Maryland side of the line dividing Maryland from Virginia, and was nearer Accomack Court House, where Mr. Makemie had his residence, than any of the congregations of Maryland. The congregation was composed of Dissenting emigrants from England, and persons of like sentiments from Virginia, who, from perpetual harassment by the persecuting Episcopalians, were glad to cross the Bay of Chesapeake, and settle out of the bounds of that intolerant colony. The members composing that congregation lived on both sides of the river Pocomoke, and some probably on the Virginia side of the dividing line. Worship was, no doubt, conducted at first on both sides of the river, and even of the dividing line, to accommodate members—but the house of worship was built on the Maryland side.* The Rev. Samuel

* It will be seen, from the license obtained by Mr. Makemie from the Court of Accomack, 1699, that his own dwelling house on Pocomoke was one of the places where he was allowed to preach. This proves that it must have been on the east side of the river, and within the Virginia line. This was probably the first place of worship that was used by that congregation, when about forming, which was afterwards removed to Rehoboth, on the opposite side of the river. Mr. Makemie owned an extensive tract of land upon Pocomoke, which lay on both sides of that river. Probably they had wor-

McMasters, who for many years had been Pastor of this church, has written a history of it, in which he says: "Mr. Makemie was the first Pastor of Rehoboth, (in fact he died its Pastor, though then it went not by the name of Rehoboth, but Pocomoke.) His successor was the Rev. John Henry, an Irish Minister, who arrived about the time of, or shortly after his death, and immediately succeeded him in Rehoboth, where he lived, in Maryland. Mr. Henry married the widow of Colonel Francis Jenkins, of whom very honorable mention is made in Makemie's will. Mrs. Jenkins was a very distinguished lady, and was left by her first husband, Col. Jenkins, without a child, and possessed of an immense fortune. By her marriage with Mr. Henry she had two sons, who became very conspicuous characters in Maryland—whose descendants to this day stand high in society. Mr. Henry continued Pastor at Rehoboth until his death in 1717. He survived Makemie only nine years. After his death, his widow married a third time, the Rev. John Hampton, Pastor of Snowhill. After this marriage, Mr. Hampton very probably divided his ministerial labors between Snowhill and Rehoboth, as the residence and large possessions of his wife lay near the latter place. Mr. Hampton had no child by this distinguished lady, and died and left her a widow the third time. She lived until 1744, when she died."

I shall now give a few authentic records from the offices of Accomack in Virginia, and Somerset in Maryland, calculated to throw light on the history and character of Makemie. I would preface them by saying that, about the latter part of the year 1697 or the beginning of 1698, (the precise time has not yet been learned,) Mr. Makemie married the daughter of a distinguished and wealthy merchant, at Accomack Court House, by the name of William Anderson, who died in October of the year 1698, before his daughter, Mrs. Makemie, had any child, and left a very large proportion of his great estate to Mr. Makemie and his wife. His last will and testament, copied from the Clerk's office of Accomack, contains the following items, viz: "Item. I will and bequeath unto Mr. Francis Makemie and Naomie, his wife, my eldest daughter, all my lands at Matchatauk—being one thousand acres, viz. six hundred by patent in my own name, and four hundred by purchase from Joseph Newton—to the said Makemie and his wife, and the heirs of their or either of their bodies, lawfully begotten, forever. But for want of such, who shall live to the full age to possess and enjoy the said lands, then the said one thousand acres of land shall revert unto my three grand-daughters,

ship at both of these places, regularly or alternately, at first; but after his death the Virginia place of worship was discontinued, and Rehoboth, in Maryland, became the only and permanent place of worship.

Elizabeth, Naomie, and Comfort Taylor, and the daughters of Elias and Comfort Taylor, and to their hereditable heirs forever. I also give unto said Makemie all the money lent him in full of all and any accounts that may be between us, upon consignments or any other ways; and my will is, that he may have the sloop, with what may appertain to her, at my death; likewise, whatever my daughter can claim as hers in my house, &c. without let or delay at all,—on both sides to be balanced; he paying six pounds to my sister Barons, and five ditto to sister Hopes, and five ditto to sister Nock, and bestowing an education to the value of fifty pounds on my three grand daughters."

"Item. I give unto the said Francis and Naomie his wife, all my plantation at Pocomoke, containing nine hundred and fifty acres, for and during their or either of their natural lives; in remainder, to the child or heir of my aforesaid daughter Naomie, *if such she have*, and its hereditable issue forever. But for want of such, then to revert and descend to my grand-daughters, by my daughter Comfort Taylor, and to her heirs forever. My meaning is, that if my daughter Naomie should become mother of more than one child, then the most worthy of blood to have Pocomoke, and the next to have Matchatauk. But, in case she die childless, after her and her husband's natural lives on it, my other grand-daughters to have it as co-heirs among them, giving them liberty to sell each of their part of the value to each other, the price of the whole being valued by any three or four honest neighbors, who may be made choice of for that purpose, to prevent either inconveniences in living so near each other or other differences that may happen by unequalling in the value; but not any one to have any power or authority to sell, give, lease, let, or by any way or means to dispose of, any part thereof out of the family that hath proceeded, or may proceed from my loins; but to my said grand-daughters and to their lawful and hereditable heirs as aforesaid forever. Nevertheless, it is my meaning, and provided, the said Makemies and the survivor of them, if my daughter have no issue, shall keep the dwelling house in repair, and whatever useful houses worth preserving thereon, likewise orchards: neither remove nor dispose of the horse-mill, still, and copper, but them to remain, and pass with the freehold to my heirs aforesaid."*

"Item. My lots, being three at Onancock town, I give unto Mr. Francis Makemie and his heirs and assigns forever."†

* This no doubt was the dwelling house which Makemie, the next year, 1699, got licensed as a place of preaching on Pocomoke.

† This Onancock was the place where Makemie lived and died, which was some five or six miles from the Court House now called Drummondstown.

"Item. I give and bequeath to my daughter Naomie Makemie four negro slaves, viz: Dollar, Hannah the elder, Darkish, and young Sarah."

"Item. I make, constitute, ordain, and appoint my son-in-law, Mr. Francis Makemie, to be my joint and several executors of this my last will and testament, desiring them to be kind and assisting to my wife."

It was, no doubt, Mr. Anderson's intention to have appointed another executor with Mr. Makemie, but it seems not to have been done.

This is as good a place as any to notice, that, from the very extensive education Mr. Makemie obtained at home, and from the comprehensive and costly library which he brought over with him, there is reason to believe that he was possessed of very considerable property of his own when he arrived in America. And, being sent out by the Dissenting Ministers and others in London, it is uncertain whether he drew upon them for any part of the money they agreed to pay their missionaries for the two first years of their services in America, or whether he chose to defray his own expenses out of his own resources. At any rate, after two years, he was required to provide for his own expenses; and, as there were no organized churches from which he could derive a salary for his support, he was obliged, like Paul at Corinth, to make his own hands minister to his necessities. It appears, therefore, that he entered into the mercantile business, and vested his funds in a stock of goods for trade. Whether he was from the first admitted into partnership with Mr. Anderson, who afterwards became his father-in-law, is uncertain—but that they were united in business at Mr. Anderson's death is quite certain, though we know not how long they had been thus connected. The prosecution of his mercantile transactions caused him to travel about a great deal, in different directions, and this gave him an introduction to many places, and afforded him an opportunity of preaching the Gospel more extensively than would otherwise have been in his power. This shows the energy, industry, and versatility of character possessed by this extraordinary man, and how extensively useful a man may be, in a variety of ways and under almost any circumstances, if he possess a right spirit and correct views of the duties of life. We also here see a rare instance of a man engaged in extensive business and possessed of great wealth, and yet not injured thereby, but using all these things as not abusing them, for the building up of the cause of Christ in the world, and in trying to save the souls of men.

In his merchant sloop he probably went to Barbadoes, in the West India trade; sending her home with a return cargo, he might have remained there, for the double purpose of preaching the Gospel and procuring a

fresh cargo against her return. This business would also take him to Elizabeth river, to a new town then commenced, which is now called Norfolk. While trading with the settlements upon York and Rappahannock rivers, he would preach the Gospel; and when pursued by his persecutors, his sloop would convey him out of reach of the danger. And, when at home, if not allowed to preach in Virginia, a few miles would take him to Maryland, where none would or could molest him. Here we have a sample of the primitive disciples, and the simplicity and efficiency of obeying Christ's ascension command, of going into all the world and preaching the Gospel to every creature. He was instant in season and out of season; through good and evil report the same devoted indefatigable laborer for his Lord and Master.

> "Alas! those suns are set. Oh! rise some other such,
> Else all that we have left is talk of old achievement
> And despair of new."

We may gather a few more fragments of records, from the county office of old Accomack, relative to this great and good man. The Clerk of said county has been obliging enough to furnish the following certificates.

"I hereby certify that the name of Francis Makemie first appears on the records of the said court on the 17th day of February, 1690, in an action brought by him against William Finny, for molasses sold by said Makemie to said Finny."

"It also appears, from the records of said court, that four hundred and fifty acres of land were granted to the said Makemie, by a certificate from said court, on the 21st day of February, 1692. The name of Francis Makemie does not appear on the records from 1692 until the 4th of October, 1698."

"The following is a true copy of an entry made on the records of said court, October 15th, 1699: 'Whereas Mr. Francis Makemie made application, by petition to this court, that, being ready to fulfil what the law enjoins to Dissenters, he may be qualified according to law, and prayed that his own dwelling-house at Pocomoke, and also his own house at Onancock, next to Captain Jonathan Livesley's, might be the places recorded for meeting; and having taken the oaths of allegiance and supremacy and subscribed the Test, as likewise that he did, in compliance with what the law enjoins, produce a certificate from Barbadoes of his qualifications there, did declare in open court of the said county, and owned the articles of religion mentioned in the statute made in the thirteenth year of Queen Elizabeth, except the 34th, 35th, and 36th, and those words of the 20th article, viz: 'The church hath power to decide rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith;' which the court have ordered to be registered and recorded, and

that the Clerk of the court give certificate thereof to the said Makemie according as the law enjoins."*

The Clerk of Accomack county further certifies that "the name of Francis Makemie appears very often on the records of said court from the year 1699 to the 1st of August, 1703, which does not contain interesting matter enough to be recited here."

"On the 1st day of August, 1703, the said Francis Makemie executed a power of attorney to his wife Naomie Makemie and John Parker, reciting that he was *about to depart for England*, and therefore constituted them his attorneys, to do and transact all manner of business for him."†

"May 30th, 1704, the said Francis Makemie executed a power of attorney for his wife Naomie Makemie, Andrew Hamilton, and James Kemps, reciting that he was about to depart for Europe."‡

"The name of Makemie does not appear on the records of the said court (except through his authorized attorney Naomie Makemie) from the 30th of May, 1704, until December 5, 1705; after which date it appears frequently on the records until his death, but which is not of sufficient interest to be recited."

"The following are true extracts from the will of the said Francis Makemie, which was recorded in the Clerk's office of Accomack county court on the 16th day of August, 1708, viz:

"I give, will, and bequeath unto my loving wife Naomie Makemie, and my two daughters Elizabeth and Anne Makemie, one hundred and twenty books, to be chosen by my executrix out of the English books of my library. My meaning and will is, that my wife and each of my daughters enjoy forty English books, and the longest livers or liver to enjoy the said books in reversion, in case of the decease of my wife or any of my said daughters, and their heirs forever. And the rest of my library of books of all sorts I give and bequeath unto Mr. Jedediah Andrews, Minister at Philadelphia, excepting my law books, and after his decease, or removal from

* It does not follow that Mr. Makemie had not preached in Accomack before this license was obtained. Admitting that, from prudential considerations, he labored mainly in Maryland, yet as the execution of laws are seldom rigorously enforced in the extremities of any country, and as Accomack was a distant and detached territory, and withal a poor and thinly settled part of the colony, it is highly probable that he had often heretofore preached when occasion offered without molestation; but being now likely to be disturbed by some meddlesome or bigoted Episcopalian, he might find it necessary to take this step for security.

† This voyage was not executed, but deferred till the next year.

‡ This voyage he executed, and returned in the spring of 1705 with Messrs. Hampton and McNish, as fellow-laborers in the church of Christ.

Philadelphia, I give and bequeath the said library to such Minister or Ministers as shall succeed him in that place and office, *and to such only as shall be of the Presbyterian or Independent persuasion, and none else.* My will is, that as soon as said books are remitted to Philadelphia, the number and names of said library may be put upon record, to be preserved there as a constant library for the use of said Minister or Ministers successively forever."

"I give, will, and bequeath unto Mr. Andrew Hamilton, and his heirs forever, all my law books to be found among my library of books, and those he already hath in possession."

"I order and empower my executor to sell, dispose of, and alien my house and lot at the new town in Princess Anne county, on the eastern branch of Elizabeth river; as also my lot and house, or frame of house, in the new town on Wormley's creek, called Urbana; as also my lot joining the new meeting-house lot in Pocomoke town, called Rehoboth, empowering my executrix to make over and alienate that lot on which the meeting-house is built in as ample a manner, to all intents and purposes, as shall be required, for the *ends and uses of a Presbyterian congregation*, as if I were personally present, and to their successors forever, *and none else* but to such of the same persuasion in matters of religion."

"I give and bequeath unto Mr. Jedediah Andrews, Minister at Philadelphia, and his heirs forever, my black camlet cloak and my new cane bought and fixed at Boston."

"I will, give, and bequeath unto my beloved wife and two daughters, Elizabeth and Anne Makemie, the remainder of my estate, real and personal, not already disposed of either by the will of Mr. William Anderson, or this will, equally to be divided among them, and the reversion of all real estate to return to the longest liver or livers of them; and if my daughters aforesaid die without issue of their natural bodies, their parts of all estate, real and personal, given by this will, I give and bequeath to my youngest sister Anne Makemie, of the kingdom of Ireland, and the two eldest sons of my brothers John and Robert Makemie, both of the name of Francis Makemie, and their heirs forever."

"I do constitute, appoint, and ordain my dear and well-beloved wife Naomie Makemie, my executrix of this my last will and testament, committing to her, and her only, the guardianship and tutorship of my aforesaid children whilst in minority, during her natural life. And in case of the death of my dear wife Naomie Makemie before this my will is proved and executed, or the arrival of my daughters Elizabeth and Anne Makemie at age, I do constitute, appoint, and ordain the Hon. Colonel Francis Jenkins, his lady and beloved consort, of Somerset county, in Maryland, executors of

this my last will and testament, and guardians to my said children during their minority, and till marriage; charging all persons concerned, in the presence of Almighty and Omniscient God, to give and allow my said children a sober, virtuous, and religious education, either here or elsewhere, as in Britain, New England, or Philadelphia; and that no other person or persons, courts or judicatories whatsoever, besides my executrix or executors nominated and appointed, and whom they shall appoint in case of the mortality of executors already appointed, shall have any power to intermeddle with my said estate, real or personal, or the tutory or guardianship of my said children, without incurring the penalty of the statutes of wards and liveries, and thereby liable to an action of trespass."

"My will and pleasure is, that, in case of my wife's marrying, she have power and authority, if she should apprehend it requisite or necessary, either before or after marrying, to relinquish her executorship, and commit the same, with relation to her children, their estate, and guardianship, unto the trust, care, and management of Colonel Francis Jenkins and his lady."

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto fixed my hand and seal this 27th of April, 1708.

"FRANCIS MAKEMIE, [L. S.]"

"The within last will and testament was proved in open court, and ordered to be recorded August 4th, 1708; and recorded August 16, 1708,

"By ROBERT SNEAD, *Clerk of County*."

Of the two daughters left by Mr. Makemie the following account is given: His eldest daughter, Elizabeth, soon followed her father; she died the same year, October 6th, 1708, young and unmarried. Anne married a gentleman by the name of Holden, and died at an advanced age, in the year 1787, having no issue; so that there runs not a drop of Makemie's blood in the veins of any human being.

It has been mentioned already that, in the spring of the year 1705, Mr. Makemie returned from Europe, bringing with him, or very shortly after him, Messrs. Hampton and McNish, two Irish Ministers, to be his fellow-laborers. The 14th of November, 1705, application was made to the County Court of Somerset, Maryland, by these newly arrived brethren, to become qualified to preach according to the provisions of the Act of Toleration for Dissenters. The Episcopal church being then established in Maryland, this request was referred to the Vestry of the parish, who made the following remarkable entry upon the occasion:

"SOMERSET COUNTY, *sct:*

"To the worshipful the Commissioners of Somerset county, the address of the Parish of Coventry humbly showeth: That whereas we have

good grounds to believe *that Mr. Francis Makemie and others, his assistants*, are intending to address your worships on account of a Toleration granted to the Dissenters for preaching and building meeting-houses, and doing what else is incumbent upon them as such, and we, duly considering the import of the matter, humbly desire that the whole as to premises be remitted to his excellency the Governor of this province, and the honorable Council of State thereof, and the same presented to your worships in open court, or to the Vestry of the said parish and the remnant Vestries therein concerned. This our humble desire we offer without any presumption of disobedience to the laws, whereof we find ourselves not competent to judge. May it therefore please your worships seriously to consider the matter above represented, and to grant our desire according to justice, and your petitioners shall ever, &c.

"Signed by order:

"JOHN HEATH, *Pro. Vestry*."

1. We learn from this document some of the difficulties these brethren were subjected to from being Dissenters. The Court submits the matter to the Vestries of the parishes lying in the county; they require that the opinion of the Governor and Council, across the bay and in another part of the State, should be obtained, and then the Court be consulted again.

2. We learn in what point of view these newly arrived Ministers were viewed. They are here called Makemie's *assistants*. This proves the agency Makemie had in forming and nursing these infant churches in Maryland. He had found the bounds too extensive and the labor too great for him to bear it any longer himself, especially as he had two small churches at Onancock and Pocomoke in his own State and county to attend to. He had gone over to England and Ireland, and brought two others to help perform the labor and bear the burden. He was now taking steps to introduce them to the office, that he might be released; they were, therefore, looked upon as Makemie's assistants. This testifies to the influence and weight of character which Makemie had acquired in these parts, as well as the tact and talent he possessed in promoting the interests of religion and the church of the Redeemer. He was a host of himself, and the master-spirit of the times in which he lived.

On the 8th of January, 1706, Messrs. Hampton and McNish appeared before the Court and renewed their petition; but as the Governor and Council had not been heard from, they were still deferred to another court. On the 12th of June, 1706, this entry is made in the records of Somerset County Court, viz:

"This day appeared Mr. John Hampton and Mr. George McNish, and exhibited an order from his excellency the Governor and honorable Coun-

cil for their qualification to preach in this county. In obedience thereto, this Court did administer the oaths appointed by act of Parliament to the said Hampton and McNish, who did comply therewith, and did likewise subscribe the Declaration; whereupon this Court did allow that the aforesaid Hampton and McNish should preach at the meeting-house near Mr. Edgar's, the meeting-house at the head of Monokin, the meeting-house at Snowhill, and the meeting-house on Mr. Joseph Venable's land, as per Dissenting Ministers required."

It appears from these records that Mr. Makemie was the means, and had the chief agency in settling Hampton and McNish in congregations in Maryland, which he by his instrumentality had previously organized, and now was pleased at having it in his power to furnish with the ministrations of the Gospel more regularly; but this was not to be accomplished without considerable difficulty. He arrived with these his coadjutors in the spring of 1705. They united with him, and others, in forming the Mother Presbytery in the summer or fall of the same year. Soon after their arrival it was announced to the Court of Somerset county that Makemie meant to address them upon the subject of permitting them to be qualified as Dissenting Ministers, according to the provisions of the Act of Toleration, as he himself had done before; but bigotry immediately took the alarm, and began to impose one difficulty after another, so that they were not permitted till the next year (June, 1706) to qualify as Ministers of the Gospel to preach in the province of Maryland. The next year (January, 1707) Makemie, with his friend Hampton, set out in the dead of winter on a preaching expedition, to go as far as Boston, taking on their way New York. Here, for preaching one sermon in a private house and baptizing a child, (for they would not let him preach in a Dutch church, and the Presbyterians had none of their own,) he was arrested by a warrant from the civil authority, and put in close confinement; and so was his friend Hampton, for preaching at the same time on Long Island. These brethren were subjected to great trials, and forced to pay heavy damages before they could get liberated. Reference is often made to the trial and persecution these Ministers underwent at New York from the infamous Lord Carnbury, Governor of that province, and partial extracts and statements have been given; but a full account, so as to do ample justice to Makemie, who had to bear the brunt of this storm, has not been given of late years, so that it has almost sunk into oblivion. Providence has, however, thrown in my way a printed pamphlet, giving publicity to a full and detailed report of the whole proceedings. It is probable that this pamphlet is the only one preserved from the ravages of time. It is considered too precious a document to be suffered to be lost, as it is calculated to throw light upon the state of the church in that day;

and without which there is no means left to do justice to the character of this father of American Presbyterianism. I can truly say I have never seen any thing that bore so strong a resemblance to the imprisonment, trial, and masterly eloquence of the Great Apostle Paul to the Gentiles, before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa, as reported in the Acts of the Apostles. As I could get only a short use of the pamphlet, I transcribed the whole, and, to save it from being entirely lost, I shall take this occasion to publish it anew to bring it before the Christian community. But as it is too long to be inserted in the midst of a work of this kind, and would break in too much upon the investigation now undertaken, it shall follow at the close of this number as an appendix. I am not afraid but that every reader will feel gratified that I have come to this conclusion, before he shall finish the perusal of it.

After the extensive documents and extracts just given, accompanied with such a full expression of my own views and statements, respecting the rise and character of American Presbyterianism, it will be thought by many, no doubt, that it is high time I should take some respectful notice of our learned Professor at Princeton, and either make my apology, or assign my reasons, for differing so widely from him in the positions and opinions I have ventured to give. I thought it would be best to suspend controversy for awhile—give my authorities at large and in connection—and then declare my opinions, without incessant interruptions of contrasting and defending them against views and sentiments antagonistic to my own. A system or scheme is seen better as a whole than in detached parts. Professor Hodge's opposite statements shall now be noticed.

Professor Hodge roundly asserts that the majority of the Puritans in England, and even of those who settled in New England, were substantially good sound Presbyterians according to the strict Scotch system, and that the Cambridge Platform of government, adopted in Massachusetts, had all the essential features of sound Presbyterianism in it—and that the Saybrook Platform, afterwards adopted in Connecticut, carried matters still further, and resembled strict Presbyterianism much more than Congregationalism. He also strenuously contends that Presbyterianism was imported into this country from Scotland, and partook of all the distinctive features of the strict and rigid Scotch system from the beginning. That all the original members of the Mother Presbytery, with one solitary exception, (i. e. Mr. Andrews,) were foreigners, and from Scotland and Ireland. This last item is asserted, and reiterated with the most confident assurance, as if it could be established by evidence beyond the power of contradiction.

I shall give a few quotations from Professor Hodge, showing how easily he slips into gratuitous assumptions, and how confidently he can deal in positive assertions, not only without evidence, but even contrary to evi-

dence. In the beginning of his second chapter, page 72, he says: "In the preceding chapter *it was shown* that the materials of the Presbyterian church were, towards the close of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century, widely scattered over the middle and southern States, *and that these materials increased with great rapidity for a series of years.*" If he gave any thing like conclusive evidence of these facts, it has entirely escaped my most rigid examination, and is positively contradicted by the letters which the Presbytery wrote to their correspondents in Europe, which have now been printed. The materials for building up the Presbyterian church at that time—i. e. "towards the close of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries"—were few indeed, and far between. They did not come already formed and laid in to their hands—but had to be hunted up and manufactured—to be trained, disciplined, and prepared for use with great labor, and in the face of appalling difficulties, as their own statements abundantly prove. It is true, as Mr. Andrews, in his letter dated October, 1730, says, that emigration from Ireland had then lately began to be in great numbers, and increased their congregations very fast—but this was more than twenty years after the Presbytery had been formed. The case was very different, however, at the close of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, when the Presbytery was about being formed.

Let us now notice Professor Hodge's statement respecting the Ministers who first formed and composed the Presbytery. See page 88: "The next subject of inquiry is, the character of the Ministers of which the Presbytery was at first composed. The original members, as far as can be ascertained from the minutes, were Messrs. Francis Makemie, Jedediah Andrews, George McNish, John Hampton, John Wilson, Nathaniel Taylor, and Samuel Davis. To these may be added John Boyd, who became a member by ordination in 1706. Of the original members of the Presbytery, Mr. Hazard says: 'It is *probable* that all, except Mr. Andrews, were foreigners by birth, and that they were ordained to the Gospel Ministry in Scotland and Ireland.' The correctness of this statement can be proved by documentary evidence in regard to most of these gentlemen, by the strongest circumstantial evidence with regard to others." Professor Hodge, in a note, quotes for proof a manuscript statement from Mr. Hazard, which he says "was written perhaps thirty years ago—it must therefore be regarded as impartial."

Now let us scrutinize this statement of our learned Professor. The conclusion he is driving at is, *that all these original members, but Mr. Andrews, were foreigners, and had been ordained to the Ministry in Scotland and Ireland.* Now for the proof. Mr. Hazard, about *thirty*

years ago, wrote that he thought it *was probable* that this was the case. Therefore, the point is settled. A Professor should be a little more logical in his reasoning than this amounts to. This probable conjecture of Mr. Hazard, about thirty years before, has been the only evidence I have yet seen, though repeatedly called for, for the confident assertions which have been repeated until they are admitted by many as establishing facts that are not to be disputed. Why was not something like conclusive evidence of these facts produced? It has been often called for. Why were we at last put off with proof like this—that somebody, some years ago, said they thought so, and somebody else wrote that they thought it was probable? And yet this is all we can get. It is well known and admitted that Messrs. Makemie, Hampton, and McNish were Irishmen, and came over to this country as ordained Ministers from Ireland, and were sent over by Dissenting Ministers in and about London; but the question is, which of them came from, or was ordained in Scotland? What evidence, positive or circumstantial, is there that either of the remaining four of the original members of the Presbytery was a foreigner, or came from Ireland, or was ordained either in Scotland or Ireland? The only answer we can get is *conjecture*, or *confident assertion*. We shall investigate this subject a little more thoroughly presently.

The reader ought to see another instance of the manner in which Professor Hodge reasons, in establishing this important point. See page 92: "So much stress [says he] has been laid upon the origin of the founders of our church, and is in reality due to it, that the preceding investigation cannot be deemed superfluous. If all, or any large proportion of them had been previously Congregationalists, the presumption would undoubtedly be, that the form of government which they instituted was more or less allied to Congregationalism. And, on the other hand, if they were all, with one exception, Scotch or Irish Presbyterians, the presumption is equally strong that the system which they adopted was in accordance with that to which they had been accustomed." "In 1707, the number of Ministers was eight, all but one from Scotland or Ireland." See pages 90, 92: "Makemie, Hampton, McNish, Henry, *Clement*, *Steward*, and Thomson, were from Scotland or Ireland.* If Davis was not, he is the

* Professor Hodge, in page 96, in his List of Clergymen, sets down Messrs. Clement and Steward as both coming from Britain, and being received by the Presbytery in the year 1718 as probationers. Now he changes the phraseology, and says that Makemie, Hampton, McNish, Henry, *Clement*, *Steward*, and Thomson were all from Scotland or Ireland. Why this change of expression? Why this vagueness of expression when he is about to establish a point, which, he asserts, would have such a bearing in determining the character of the government established by the Presbytery? Why did he

only exception." [Now let the reader attend.] "In the absence of all evidence to the contrary, or of any circumstances connecting him with New England, it is in the highest degree *probable* that he had the same origin with his associates."

The first remark I make upon this quotation is, the great anxiety our Professor manifests to get something from Scotland to impart something of the kind to our church. He knew that none of the men whose names he mentioned were from Scotland, for in his list he derives them all from Ireland or England. But he cannot forbear telling us, however, that Dr. Rodgers thought Makemie was from Scotland, and that Hampton was either from Scotland or Ireland. His Scotch articles were scarce, and his Scotch evidence still scarcer; but appearances must be kept up. But how does he prove that Mr. Davis was from Scotland or Ireland? Why, he asserts that all the rest were, and, if we cannot produce evidence to the contrary, he must be from Scotland or Ireland also, of course. And is our distracted church to be edified and set right with arguments like these?

It will appear, from what has already been stated, that the Presbyterianism of this country was indebted for its origin not to the Kirk of Scotland, but to the united exertions of Dissenters in and about London. But Professor Hodge seems determined that this argument shall avail us nothing, for he contends that the Puritans in England were generally good consistent Presbyterians, holding all the essential elements of the strict Scotch system. It will then be necessary to show upon what evidence it can be proved that American Presbyterianism was derived from England rather than Scotland, and then to show what kind of Presbyterianism prevailed in England at the time.

It is admitted on all hands that the Rev. Francis Makemie was sent as a missionary to the American colonies by the Dissenting Ministers in and about London. Dr. Miller, in his life of Dr. Rodgers, asserts this as an indisputable fact, and professes to derive his information from some of the most ancient and venerable Ministers who were then alive, and who were well acquainted with the circumstances.

The letters written by the Presbytery, after its formation, refer to the

not tell us which were from Scotland, and which from Ireland? He either had documents to settle this matter, or he had not. If he had proof, was he not bound to produce it? And if he could have proved that any number, or even any one of them, was from Scotland, is there not reason to believe, from the anxiety he constantly discovers to derive something from Scotland to establish his favorite position, he would not have failed to do so? If he had no documents, or authority, to settle this disputed point, was it candid, was it justifiable for him to use such a bold and unqualified assertion, and have left this matter so, without any thing to rest his assertion upon?

engagement entered into by these London Ministers when Mr. Makemie was with them—and lament that it had fallen through, and earnestly entreat that it might again be revived. By this engagement, the Dissenting Ministers pledged themselves to send out two missionaries at a time, and support them for two years; after which time it was expected they would form congregations, and locate themselves among them, and derive their support from those congregations without drawing upon their patrons in London for any further aid. These London Ministers engaged that they would then send out two others upon the same conditions. While the Union lasted—which was begun in the year 1690 and finished and published in 1691—there was a fund raised by the Union to assist weak congregations, and to send the Gospel into foreign parts. After several Independents, from dissatisfaction, had withdrawn from this Union, there were two funds kept—one called the Independent fund, and the other the Presbyterian fund. It was no doubt from the fund of the united body that the first missionaries to America received their aid.

Mr. Makemie was sent out from London about the year 1690, when this Union was just formed, or forming. Whether they had raised funds at this early period of their Union, or whether Mr. Makemie received any pecuniary aid from this Union, is uncertain, though he was then present with them. The probability is, that at this time their plans had not arrived at such maturity as to have produced funds to any amount; and even if they had money that could have been appropriated to such a use, there is reason to believe that Mr. Makemie did not need assistance of the kind. It is reasonable to conclude, from the very liberal education he had received, the valuable and extensive library he brought over with him, and the property which it is known he possessed before his marriage with Mr. Anderson's daughter, that he had other resources to draw upon than those of charity. Whether this pledge of missionary aid was given to Mr. Makemie when he was first with them, before coming to America, or afterwards, when he visited them in 1704, we have ample evidence that he prevailed on them at the latter period to give him assistance, and that the aid thus derived enabled him to bring over two clerical brethren, Hampton and McNish, from his native country Ireland, which was the first Presbyterian help he procured in aid of his extensive labors in America. It is more than probable, as Mr. Makemie had just formed an intimate friendship with Mr. Andrews, who had lately settled in Philadelphia, and was struggling to organize an infant church in that city, that the plan of strengthening each other, and securing united and more efficient exertions, had been devised by them for the purpose of endeavoring to get up and form a Presbytery; and that while Makemie was exerting himself to pro-

cure laborers from Europe, Andrews was using his influence among his New England brethren to obtain settled Ministers from that quarter. We have no documentary or traditional evidence, worthy of credit, that in the year 1700 there was any other Dissenting English Minister located within the bounds occupied by any one of the original members of the Presbytery, except Makemie in Accomack, and Andrews in Philadelphia. We know that missionaries were at that time frequently sent from New England through East and West Jersey, the three lower counties or territories of Pennsylvania, (as they were then called,) and Maryland; but none had formed settlements, at that early period, in those limits which were occupied at first by the Mother Presbytery, except the two that have been just mentioned. But when Makemie returned from Europe in the spring of 1705 with Hampton and McNish, there were four, including Andrews, within those limits ready for co-operation, and the Presbytery was formed during the summer or autumn of the same year. When this Presbytery was formed, there can be no doubt but that every member was entirely orthodox or Calvinistic in his doctrinal sentiments—but upon the subject of government and discipline they met upon the most liberal and conciliating principles. This we shall feel ourselves able to establish in due time, by documents that ought to satisfy every candid inquirer after truth. The principles upon which the Mother Presbytery was formed were of London origin, and not of the rigid, sectarian, Divine right plan of Scotland.

As American Presbyterianism descended so directly from the Presbyterianism of England, we shall now inquire into the rise, progress, and character of English Presbyterianism, which would naturally exert such an influence in forming the features of her daughter. In performing this part of my labor, I am happy in saying the work is already done to my hand in a late publication from London, entitled "An Historical Inquiry concerning the Principles, Opinions, and Usages of the English Presbyterians." This historical inquiry includes the period from the restoration of Charles II, in the year 1660, to the death of Queen Anne, in 1714; and is the production of Joshua Wilson, Esq., of the Inner Temple, one of the counsel employed in the famous Presbyterian law-suit of England, lately decided, respecting the charitable trusts founded by Lady Sarah Hewley in the years 1704 and 1707. This is an important and instructive work—the result of great research and free access to the best sources of information. The learned counsel knew it would be worse than useless to be careless in his positions and unguarded in his authorities, as it would expose him to immediate detection by the most talented and competent counsel on the other side, and before the ablest judges. It contains a mass of information upon

this subject, which can nowhere else be found in so short a compass. If our respected Princeton Professor and our adventurous Virginia Editor could have had an opportunity of consulting this work, it might have been beneficial to both of them, and saved them the mortification of coming so violently in conflict with each other. The one would have found that the English Presbyterians were a very different people from Scotch Presbyterians—and the other, that they were, at the time alluded to, as sound in the faith, and as Calvinistically orthodox, as the Westminster Confession, or the Savoy Confession, or the articles of the Church of England could make them. Though they were opposed to rigorously exacting a subscription to extensive human creeds and tests of orthodoxy, yet they had other methods which they preferred, and which they thought would be more effectual in preserving the purity of their churches, and guarding them from the ruinous errors into which many of them afterwards fell by neglecting the safeguards that were then in use.

Having taken up so much time already in giving so many and such lengthy extracts from various authorities, I shall have to limit myself in the use which might be made of this history of English Presbyterians to such a degree as will impose upon me an unpleasant and embarrassing restraint. Without quoting literally from this author, except upon particular occasions, I shall, in a summary manner, mention facts which he has established, and from the most authentic and indisputable sources.

Before the restoration of Charles II, or during the Commonwealth, owing to the influence which the rigid and restrictive advocates of the Church of Scotland exerted during the critical situation of England from its bloody and doubtful struggle with her King and his persecuting Bishops, the Parliament agreed to establish Presbyterianism, and make common cause with Scotland upon the subject of religion. But it is evident, from the temper manifested in the opposition made to this mode of church polity both before and afterward, and from the fact that Parliament to the last refused to establish Presbyterianism as of Divine right, that religion in this form was forced upon them, and very reluctantly submitted to at the time; and, to the last, they reserved the right to abolish it whenever they should think proper to do so. Professor Hodge was right in saying the majority of the English nation, as well as of the Parliament, were Presbyterians at that time; but he did not tell us what kind of Presbyterians they were, nor how they came to be made so, nor how long it lasted—but labored hard to make the impression that there was no material difference between them and the Scotch, who pleaded Divine authority for their entire form, with their Solemn League and Covenant, and that no other system or form of worship was to be tolerated. Such was the Scotch system in that day, and such it

must be, to be consistent, if Divine authority from the Scriptures for their whole form of government can be established. If the advocates of this illiberal and exclusive system had consented, with the Independents and the most enlightened of their republican politicians, to admit a general toleration and religious freedom for all sects, King Charles never would have reached the throne, nor would monarchy or prelatical Episcopacy have been again established in England. So short-sighted and mischievous was this intolerant and bigoted system at that time; and this same system has sown the seeds of discord and anarchy in the American churches ever since it was introduced among them. It was this that brought on the contentions which produced the great schism in the American church in 1741; it was an attempt to introduce the same high-handed and overbearing policy, and a grasping at the same power, which has reduced our once harmonious and prosperous Zion to its present divided and distracted condition; and such must inevitably be its fruits wherever it is practised upon. It must domineer or come down.

It was with sanguine calculations of bearing down all before them that the Scotch Presbyterians, and those whom they had won over to their sentiments in England, invited Charles to come over and take the crown; for they had made that unprincipled hypocrite swallow their Solemn League and Covenant while in Scotland, as well as the most of the people in England. But the Presbyterian interest, in both nations, would not have been strong enough of itself to have brought Charles home in peace and quietness, had there not been other causes to co-operate. Many of the most influential among the Independents, and others, as well as the Episcopalians, had learned such a lesson from Scotch Presbyterianism during its short reign in England—had so smarted under its first fruits, and seen so clearly what might be expected from its continuance, that they were heartily sick of the change, and thought they could not be worsted let what change come that might. Hence the open and free course for the restoration of the Stuarts to the English throne again. Great was the disappointment of all but the cavaliers and lordly prelatical clergy.

Charles seemed half inclined, at first, to admit of a general toleration and religious freedom. This, with the exception of Catholics and a few others, was earnestly contended for by the Independents and other sects; but the Presbyterians, still hoping for success, would not consent to it. They soon saw they would not be gratified to the extent of their wishes, and now the half-disciplined Presbyterians of England began to lower their tone, and they expressed a willingness to meet the Episcopalians upon the half-way ground of a reduced Episcopacy. But this failing them, their next effort was for a comprehension, or an accommodation, by which they might be

suffered to stand at least upon equal terms with Episcopalians. But even this failed them; and they were taught what they might expect, as the legitimate effects of their beloved system of *jure divino* uniformity, by the famous St. Bartholomew's act of 1662, when two thousand ministerial brethren were silenced and reduced to beggary, or forced to fly from their country.

Thus terminated Scotch Presbyterianism in England. High scenes were transacted in Scotland between these two schemes of Divine right and uniformity in religion. But Presbyterianism in England henceforward assumed a new character, and they learned modesty and meekness in the school of adversity. Now they were made to resemble primitive Christians, who had never sat at the right hand of authority, nor enjoyed a temporal kingdom and glory. Brethren in calamity had learned to love one another, and found that they were not so wide apart as they had supposed. They began now to associate with each other, and exchange friendly offices with one another. They had drawn so closely together that, about the time William Prince of Orange effected the revolution in 1688, and mounted the throne of England, the Presbyterians and Independents were ready to drop their distinctive names and characters, and be known by the name of the *United Brethren.* This union was gradually brought about, and a year or two passed away before it was concluded and published to the world, which took place in the beginning of the year 1691. It was commenced by the Dissenting brethren in and about London. Before this union there existed a strange and very unsettled state of things among these two denominations. With those denominated Presbyterians there existed no uniform system of church government; except in and about London, and in one or two of the northern counties, there were no regularly organized Presbyteries, nor any regular and general meetings in Synod. There were associations for mutual counsel and improvement, but not for government as a distinct body; for, in many instances, Independents, and in some cases Baptists, united in those associations. When ordinations were to take place, it was seldom done by a regularly organized Presbytery, but a few Ministers, invited for the occasion or drawn together by elective affinity, officiated, and the same members seldom met together a second time upon similar occasions. This was much nearer allied to the mode of Congregationalism than of Presbyterianism; but their perilous circumstances compelled them to resort to such measures, and often had they to perform those duties with the greatest secrecy.

When the Union, which was published in 1691, was formed, the Presbyterians throughout the country generally came most cordially into it; but there were several Independents, and among them some of their most

prominent men, who raised objections and stood aloof, but at length, after various attempts at pacification, opposition appeared to cease even from this quarter. But this harmony was soon again interrupted. The occasion was this: the son of the celebrated Doctor Tobias Crisp, a notorious Antinomian of that day, had republished his father's works, with an addition of some other sermons from his father's manuscripts, which sermons were recommended by having the names of several of the members of the Union appended to them. Doctor Daniel Williams, a leading Divine among the Presbyterians, published an opposition to some of the sentiments contained in those sermons respecting the doctrine of justification, as being unsound. Messrs. Chauncy and Mather, who had never been much in favor of the Union, defended those sermons with great zeal and bitterness. See Wilson's History, pages 74, 75.

In the year 1672, when King Charles issued a declaration suspending the penal laws against Dissenters, the Presbyterians and Independents, through the contributions of the principal merchants and tradesmen of their persuasion in London, set up a weekly lecture at Pinner's Hall, to show their agreement among themselves, as well as to support the doctrines of the Reformation against the prevailing errors of Popery, Socinianism, and Infidelity. See Wilson's History, page 40. These lectures had been kept up, with great harmony and usefulness, by these two denominations, until the disputes which arose about the publication of Doctor Crisp's works. But, toward the close of the year 1694, an open rupture took place among the lecturers of Pinner's Hall, and another lecture was set up by a few of the most violent Independents, or Congregationalists, as they began now to be called, at Salter's Hall: which was conducted with considerable acrimony for awhile, but finally died away, and the Salter's Hall lecture became extinct, but the Pinner's Hall lecture continues to the present day. This division among the lecturers was a great grief to the members of the Union, but did not break it up, for it was confined to a few bitter spirits among the Independents, who proclaimed aloud that error had crept in among the members of the Union, and they were accused of Arminianism because they opposed Doctor Crisp's Antinomian errors. See Wilson's History, passim.

That both the English Presbyterians and Congregationalists (with the exception of a few ultra-Calvinists who bordered closely on Antinomianism) were sound orthodox Calvinists, equally opposed to Arminianism on the one hand, and Antinomianism on the other, Wilson, in his history, proves by testimony that no one can doubt. But if other testimony were wanting, the articles of the Union would of themselves be sufficient.

It is true that the Presbyterians and Independents, both before and after

their union, were opposed to rigidly enforcing subscriptions to any lengthy creeds, formularies, or tests of orthodoxy, other than the Scriptures, or such as were confined to Scripture language. Whether they were wise for so doing is another question, which I shall not here undertake to settle. But, if they erred in this, the error was not of such a dangerous chaacter but that its dangerous tendencies were well provided against, by safeguards and usages of another character, which preserved their purity as well, or nearly so, as it was in those societies who enforced subscriptions in the most rigid manner. That the English Presbyterians have, in latter days, degenerated to an awful extent, and become a nest of Unitarians, is a melancholy fact known to every one. But whether this defection was attributable solely or mainly to their opposition to human creeds and confessions, is a questionable matter. This may be seen in the Church of England, whose articles are as Calvinistic as the Westminster Confession, yet the rankest Arminians, and often Unitarians, subscribe them without hesitation. Look at Geneva, the cradle of Calvinism—has subscription operated any better there? Look at Germany, at present the hotbed of neology and disguised infidelity. Look at Scotland itself, with all its rigor and strictness, Arminians, Arians, and Socinians, and what Dr. Witherspoon, in his characteristics, calls moderate theology, have corrupted even this Simon Pure himself. The Solemn League and Covenant, which was sworn to by the Scotch and English generally, was but a rope of sand when Episcopacy was again set up in both those nations.

The English Presbyterians were not indifferent upon this subject, nor disposed to connive at error. The articles of the London Union, one would suppose, carried this matter as far as was necessary; and if they could not shut out error, it is not easy to show what would. Notice the eighth article in that Union. "As to what appertains to soundness of judgment in matters of faith, we esteem it sufficient that a church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice; *and own* either the doctrinal part of those commonly called the Articles of the Church of England, or the confession or catechisms, shorter and larger, compiled by the Assembly at Westminster, or the confession agreed on at the Savoy, to be agreeable to said rule." With what consistency they could oppose subscription to creeds and confessions, and yet require assent to this article from those who entered into their Union, is not for me to say, for in my estimation it would amount to the same thing. At least, I could be satisfied with a vow of the kind. See, also, the third section of article first, respecting Church members: "That none shall be admitted as members, in order to commune in all the special ordinances of the Gospel, but such as are *knowing and sound* in the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion," &c.

The English Presbyterians were unusually exact and particular in having their young people and children taught the Westminster larger and shorter catechisms, which they had adopted as of standard authority among them, and were very particular in requiring "a credible profession of religion and cordial subjection to Jesus Christ," in admitting members to the communion. Would that there was as much attention paid to these things by the church now, as they paid to them in these olden times!

In admitting candidates into the Ministry, although they did not require a formal subscription to any particular test of orthodoxy, they were very careful in requiring from every one a written *declaration*, as they called it, respecting his sentiments and views in regard to the essential or fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, drawn up in his own language; and, to show his dexterity in answering an adversary, every candidate for the Ministry was required to defend a *thesis*, in Latin, upon some controverted subject of divinity, against any or all of the members who chose to take the other side. They had to pass an examination the most rigid upon language and science. The requirements in that day were much higher than are now demanded from those seeking the Ministry, and the whole was closed by a very rigid and close examination upon theology—practical, theoretic, and polemic—by word of mouth. Mr. Wilson's history has given the most satisfactory documents to establish all these points. But it is unnecessary to say more to prove what is admitted on all hands. Drs. Green, Miller, and Hodge, all unhesitatingly admit this, respecting the first members of our Mother Presbytery, and of the English Presbyterians of those times. I know of no one who has ventured to call their orthodoxy and soundness in the faith in question but Dr. Plumer, of Virginia, who, it is presumed, has been led astray by the slanderous statements which some of the Unitarians of the present day have raised against these venerable worthies, to induce others to believe they were like minded with themselves, that they might have a plausible pretext for keeping possession of the funds which were raised, by their predecessors, to defend doctrines which it is their main design now to vilify and destroy.

I shall now add a few things more relating to their sentiments and practice respecting government and discipline in the church of Jesus Christ.

Under the second article of the heads of agreement, respecting the Ministry, section 5th, it is thus provided: "After the person in view has been chosen by the brotherhood of that particular church over which he is to be set, and he accepting, he should be duly ordained and set apart to his office over them; *wherein 'tis ordinarily requisite* that the Pastors of neighboring congregations concur with the Preaching Elder or Elders, if such there be." Here ordination may be performed, it seems, by the

Preaching Elder or Elders of a particular congregation, if there be such, but, *in ordinary cases*, it would be requisite that the Pastors of neighboring congregations should concur. Ordination, according to this plan, might be performed by any neighboring Ministers who could conveniently be had, and it was not necessary that it should be done by an organized Presbytery, consisting of a certain number of Ministers. Quere. Was this according to the rigid Divine right system of Scotland? We shall make it appear hereafter that the Mother Presbytery in this country, in some instances, suffered this to be done and sanctioned the procedure. Quere. Was this practice derived from Scotland, or the United Brethern of London, or did it come from New England? I shall leave this for Professor Hodge to solve.

Again, in article 4th, of Communion of Churches, section 2d: "That none of our particular churches shall be subordinate to one another, each being endowed with equality of power from Jesus Christ, and that none of the said particular churches, their officer or officers, shall *exercise any power, or have any superiority over any other church, or their officers.*" Quere. Is this strict Presbyterianism or Independency?

Again, article 5th, respecting Deacons and Ruling Elders: "And whereas divers are of opinion that there is also (i. e. besides Deacons) the office of Ruling Elders, who labor not in word and doctrine, *and others think otherwise*, we agree that this difference make no breach among us." Quere. Is this in accordance with the *jure divino* plan of Scotland? Let Dr. Hodge answer. But I expect to prove positively that it was in conformity with the usage of the Mother Presbytery. Whence then did she derive parentage? From Old England, or New England, or Scotland?

Once more, article 5th, of occasional meeting of Ministers, &c. "1. We agree that, in order to concord, and in any weighty matter, and difficult cases, it is needful and according to the mind of Christ that the Ministers of several churches be consulted and advised with about such matters. 2d. That such Ministers may consist of smaller or greater numbers, as the matter shall require. 3d. That particular churches, their respective Elders and members, ought to have a reverential regard to their judgments so given, *and not dissent therefrom without apparent grounds from the word of God.*" Quere. Is this Presbyterianism upon *jure divino* principles? Again: Is not the right here reserved to the members to submit, obey or not, according as they may judge the decision has or has not been agreeable to the word of God? If so, is it agreeable to the essential elements of Scotch Presbyterianism? No, but it is in exact accordance with the adopting act of 1729. Whence then did this kind of Presbyterianism emanate?

So much stress would not have been laid upon arguments of this kind, nor so much time spent in support of them, if Professor Hodge had not raised such a "learned dust" upon this point; for a great part of his elaborate performance is taken up in establishing the pedigree of American Presbyterians. "If [says he] *they were all, with one exception, Scotch and Irish Presbyterians, the presumption is strong that the system which they adopted was in accordance to that to which they had been accustomed.*" This must be my apology to my readers for taking up so much of their time in referring to occurrences which may appear to have such a remote bearing upon the subject we have in hand.

I shall now give a more particular account of the original members who formed the Presbytery, and the location of their congregations. Let it be remembered that I am not going at present beyond the members at the first formation. Professor Hodge manifests no little ingenuity in jumbling these original members with those who after some years became connected with the Presbytery. It is very manifest what his reason was for this politic move; his object was to prove that all the original members were from Scotland and Ireland except one, i. e. Mr. Andrews. He found, however, that he had undertaken a difficult task, and that he could not call up the witnesses he needed to establish that point from the "vasty deep," or if he should call for them, that they would not come. He therefore found it necessary, to extricate himself from this difficulty, to make a flourish of all the names belonging to the Synod after it was formed, and assign to each one his native country and ancestry, and thus make his escape, as if he had established his point. We shall examine hereafter how well he has succeeded even in this piece of management. But, as the Presbytery received its distinctive character at its formation, we shall now confine ourselves honestly and solely to that point, and to that point alone, with an occasional allusion only to aftertimes when circumstances may require it.

The Presbytery of Philadelphia, which was the first that was formed in America, and therefore the mother from which all the others sprung, must have been formed either in the summer or autumn of the year 1705—most likely the latter. It could not have been earlier, for Mr. Makemie, who may justly be called the father of American Presbyterianism, was in Europe during the year 1704, and did not return, as has been proved from authentic documents, till the spring of 1705. We call him the father of American Presbyterianism because he had been laboring alone, as a Presbyterian Minister, for fifteen years before, and spreading his labors, and very successful labors too, from Virginia to Boston, and had exerted a powerful influence in Virginia, Maryland, and the settlements on the Delaware bay and river, as high up as Philadelphia. His permanent residence had been,

since 1690, on the eastern shore of Virginia, in Accomack county, near the dividing line between Virginia and Maryland. He was induced, no doubt, to locate himself there that he might elude persecution, which, it is said, he had endured in Virginia from the overbearing Episcopal church and the civil authority, which two were in close alliance. Doctor Miller, in his memoirs of Doctor Rodgers, has merely alluded to his persecutions in Virginia by the civil authority, the slanders there raised against him, and his defence of himself in a pamphlet which he published upon the occasion. Doctor Miller informed me that he received this account from the aged and venerable Doctor Reed, formerly of Wilmington, Delaware, who was well informed upon this subject, and said he had read Makemie's defence of himself. But, as I have not been able to recover any of those documents, no more can be said upon that subject. Besides the influence he exerted in Virginia, upon Elizabeth river, where Norfolk now stands, and from thence to Urbana, upon the Rappahannock, where he owned a residence of some kind, his chief field of labor was on the eastern shore of Maryland, near the Virginia line, where liberty of conscience and religious freedom were enjoyed, and where a number of the persecuted Dissenters, or Puritans from Virginia, as Doctor Hawks's authority calls them, had settled. He had organized four Presbyterian congregations in Maryland before he organized one in Virginia, though his residence was in that State. This was, no doubt, owing to obstacles thrown in his way by the laws of persecution. Whatever effect his preaching produced among the people, he dare not then attempt to organize them as a church. But in Maryland an effectual door was opened for him, and he did not fail to use it.

Having organized four churches in Maryland, and increased his work to an amount beyond the capacity of any one man to perform, he began to look to his old friends in England and Ireland for assistance. Thither he went in the year 1704. He attempted to make this journey the year before, but was prevented. He proceeded first to London, where he had many friends, under whose patronage and direction he himself was first induced to carry the Gospel to benighted America. He prevailed upon them to revive, or renew their former engagement, which had well nigh fallen through or been forgotten—that is, to keep two missionaries constantly employed in the American field, sustained by their funds. They entered anew upon this enterprise, which now offered such flattering prospects. Reference is made, in the published letters of the Presbytery, to these transactions of Makemie in London, as the reader has already seen. Having appointed Doctor Calamy their patron and chief agent—who, Mr. Wilson in his history says, was a warm friend and an active member of the London Union so often referred to—Mr. Makemie hastened over to Ireland, his native

country, and soon obtained two fellow-laborers (Hampton and McNish) to accompany him, under these auspices, to America. Professor Hodge will never be able to establish, by any of his unpublished manuscripts, of which he makes so much use, nor by the hearsay tradition of Doctor Rodgers or any other man, that either Makemie or Hampton or McNish had any other connexion with Scotland, except that their ancestors at some former day emigrated to Ireland from Scotland, and were therefore called Scotch Irish, but not Scotch and Irish, as our Professor will often have it.

Let us now, since we are upon this subject, have a word about Irish Presbyterianism, which Professor Hodge seems to think identically the same as the Kirk of Scotland. Is this the fact? Is there any connecting link by which the one church is bound to the other? Is there even a fraternal intercourse of ecclesiastical correspondence between these two bodies? Has one any authority over the other? Or has the General Assembly of Scotland, in the plenitude of its power, or any other General Assembly, any control over the Irish Ministers or churches? According to Doctor Hodge, Ruling Elders, Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, are the essential elementary constituent of true Scotch Presbyterianism. Is not Ireland deficient in one of these most important and essential elements of *jure divino* Presbyterianism? No Irish Minister would be admitted into any of the Divine right pulpits of Scotland, nor be allowed to sit as a corresponding member in any of their ecclesiastical judicatories, nor as a representative in their *jure divino* General Assembly, nor be allowed to witness their proceedings, unless (as I have known to be the case) he should pay the doorkeeper an extortionate fee to find him a seat in some crowded gallery. But will it be said that the Irish churches have a regular church system of their own, and that their Synods come in the place, and answer all the purposes of, a General Assembly? Be it so. But still there is one essential link in the Divinely constituted Church of Scotland wanting, and if one may be dispensed with, why not another? What then will become of true and genuine Presbyterianism? But I am beginning to fear my readers will accuse me of trifling and wandering from the subject. I will stand corrected; and the only apology I can offer is, that I have an artful and wandering opponent to contend with, and if I do not wander and trifle a little at times I shall not fairly overtake him, to correct the wrong impressions he may leave behind him.

If it still be insisted upon that the Irish Synod is substantially the same to the Irish church that the General Assembly is to Scotland, and that, in all important respects, they are the same church, then I would ask, would the General Assembly of Scotland consider themselves responsible for the doings of the Irish church, when, some years ago, Arianism and Socinian-

ism had well nigh eaten up the Synod of Ulster? This would reflect no honor upon the preservative and sanative principles of the Church of Scotland. The fact is, there is a manifest difference between the Presbyterianism of Scotland and that of Ireland, which every person of discernment can easily discover. This difference is seen to increase according to the length of time they have been apart. In the days of Makemie there was more liberality among the Irish, upon the subject of religious tolerance, than among the Scotch. It is hardly probable that any genuine son of the Kirk could have been induced to act under the patronage or direction of the London Union, where such liberty of conscience and respect to private judgment were tolerated. The legal establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland, with all its Divine claims, made that nation always opposed to religious freedom; and they remonstrated bitterly, and bore repeated testimony against the Act of Toleration passed by William Prince of Orange. Irish Presbyterians felt differently upon this subject, and were always in favor of that noble act. Makemie, Hampton, and McNish are instances of this Irish liberality, nor did they carry their *jure divino* claims to the same pernicious extent as the Scotch always did.

Here, then, in the year 1705, we have three Irish Presbyterians sheltering themselves under the Act of Toleration, and ready to join others in forming a Presbytery; but not a Scotchman can be found in all the number of those concerned. I know Professor Hodge has made a Scotchman of Mr. Nathaniel Taylor, and located him over an organized Scotch church at Marlborough, in Maryland, from the year 1690—the very same year that Makemie began his labors on the eastern shore. But why he and Makemie did not find each other out in all this time is rather mysterious. It was not long before Makemie and Andrews became acquainted with each other, after the latter had fixed himself at Philadelphia, though they were much further apart. And why could not Doctor Hawks, in all his researches, find that there was this settled Presbyterian Minister with his congregation in the very centre of Maryland. The Episcopal church was then established in Maryland, and her Ministers, in giving an account to their Diocesan Bishop of London of the state of religion *during this very period* in Maryland, give a detailed account not only of their own numbers, but of the Catholics, Quakers, and all other sects to be found among them, but never once allude to the settlement of a Presbyterian Minister and his Dissenting Scotch church at Marlborough. They complain loudly of itinerant missionaries from New England, whom they stigmatize by many hard names of abuse—they allude to the progress of Presbyterians on the eastern shore—but they never allude to any settled Presbyterian or Congregational Minister within the province of Maryland. They complain heavily of strolling itinerants, but of none others.

Again: If Mr. Nathaniel Taylor, one of the original members, had been the Pastor of an organized congregation of Scotch Presbyterians at Marlborough, why do the Presbytery, in all their letters and minutes, overlook this congregation or pass it over with entire silence? But this is not all; they do not so much as give it place among their congregations, but only claim four as lying in the State of Maryland. This has puzzled Professor Hodge more than a little; for he has now, at this late day, found that they were mistaken, and, instead of four, actually had six congregations. Rather than lose one Scotch Minister and his Scotch congregation in making up the Presbytery, he seems to insist that the Presbytery made a false report, and ought to be set right upon this subject. There would be no difficulty in finding the four congregations the Presbytery spoke of. They were the four which Makemie had organized in Somerset county, on the Eastern Shore, and over which Hampton now had the pastoral charge of two, and McNish the charge of the other two.* But, if Professor Hodge will accept of my assistance, I can relieve him of his difficulty at once, and save the veracity of the Presbytery at the same time. The congregation of Rehoboth, which he has found in Maryland, was the one that Makemie had charge of at his death, and was then called Pocomoke, and the place they had to worship in at that time lay on the other side of the river Pocomoke, within the limits of Virginia. This place, which Makemie got licensed as a place of worship under the Act of Toleration, was a dwelling-house which belonged to himself, but which he did not then occupy. The members of this little congregation were scattered along on both sides of this little river, some lying on the Maryland side and some on the Virginia side of the dividing line. But, about the time of Makemie's death, it was determined to build a house of worship on the Maryland side, in a little village which lay near the mouth of Pocomoke; so that Virginia lost one of its congregations and Maryland gained one some short

* This is Professor Hodge's account of this matter, page 77: "It is not easy to reconcile altogether the statements given in the Presbyterial letter quoted above, with the facts recorded on the minutes." [The minutes do not clash with the letters at all, but Professor Hodge's manuscript letters and hearsay testimony do most seriously.] "For example, it is said there were four churches in Maryland in connexion with the Presbytery in 1710, whereas the minutes mention at least five." [The minutes nowhere say there were five churches in Maryland. Our Professor further says:] "It is probable that when two congregations were under the care of the same Pastor, they were not counted separately. The congregations were Upper Marlborough, Snowhill, Rehoboth, Monokin, and Wicomico." Will Professor Hodge please produce the minutes of the Presbytery as early as 1710 in which Upper Marlborough is mentioned as an organized congregation, or as a congregation at all. If he cannot, ought he not to confess he has wandered out of the record?

time after Makemie's death. This Maryland congregation, or rather change in the name and location of the congregation, the Presbytery had not yet noticed in its minutes and letters.

I know but of one way of defending the Presbytery in their statement respecting the congregation of Marlborough, and that is, by maintaining there was no such congregation in existence at the time the statement was given in 1710, much less in 1705, when the Presbytery was formed. For several years after the letter of 1710 was written, application was frequently made to the Presbytery from desolate regions of country, both in Virginia and Maryland, for preachers to be sent to them, and, among the others, an application of the kind was made from Patuxent. (Marlborough lies on this river.) The Presbytery sent different Ministers at different times to preach to those desolate districts. About the year 1714 two young men, licentiates or students of theology, arrived from England, Hugh Conn and John Orme. The next year (1715) Mr. Conn was ordained, and sent to preach to the people about Patuxent and Bladensburg. He organized congregations at each of these places, became their first Pastor, and lived and died such. His end was a remarkable one. He dropped dead in the midst of his sermon in the pulpit in Bladensburg. I was intimately acquainted with his successor, the Rev. Mr. Hunt, and preached his funeral sermon when he died. Mr. Orme was, about the same time, sent to preach to the people in the same region, with his intimate friend and countryman Conn, shortly after he commenced his labors in Maryland. They both organized churches in that vacant district of country, and lived as near neighbors till their death. I was well acquainted with Col. John Orme, the son of this Minister, and his grand-daughter, lately under my pastoral care, is still living in Alexandria. From these persons I received particular information respecting this part of Maryland. All these accounts concur in saying there never was any congregation organized in that region of country before Messrs. Conn and Orme came among them. And as to the Scotch colony of two hundred Presbyterians settling at Marlborough, they never hinted at any such thing, but mentioned there were a few Scotch merchants settled at Marlborough, who became active members of the church after Mr. Conn settled at that place. This accounts for the silence of the Presbytery respecting Marlborough, when giving an account of their congregations in 1710. This also shows what reliance is to be put upon the mass of old letters, and the hearsay testimony, which Professor Hodge has made such free use of in obtaining Scotch members, Scotch congregations, and Scotch principles, of which to form the Mother Presbytery.

I shall take this opportunity of defending the correctness of the state-

ment given by the Presbytery, respecting the number of congregations they had in Virginia. The Presbytery claimed in 1710 but one congregation in Virginia, and located that one on Elizabeth river, about Norfolk. Professor Hodge thinks that was a Scotch colony too. There had been a feeble congregation in that place before Makemie's death; but when organized or by whom got together, except by Makemie himself, who had a dwelling-house at the place, we know not. About the time of Makemie's death, two other Irish Ministers arrived, Messrs. Henry and Macky. We have no certain information how they were induced to come to America. But we know how Makemie got the assistance of Hampton and McNish, and how their expenses were borne, and what arrangements he had made in London for a fresh supply of Ministers every two years. About two years after Hampton and McNish came over, two other Irish Ministers arrived. One (Mr. Macky) settled on Elizabeth river, in the neighborhood of Makemie; and the other (Mr. Henry) succeeded him in his congregation of Pocomoke, but which is now called Rehoboth, and married Mr. Makemie's dear and intimate friend, Madam Jenkins, the widow of Col. Jenkins, to whose care Makemie, in his will, directed his children to be committed in the event of his wife's death or marriage. Macky soon had to fly from Elizabeth river on account of persecution, and his congregation soon became extinct from the same cause. Professor Hodge's Scotch colony, if they ever existed, were poor Presbyterians if they remained there, as he thinks they did, and gave up their religion so easily.

But what became of Makemie's other congregation in Accomack after his death? It became extinct—as it was a young and feeble one at his death, and no one ventured, after the treatment which Macky had received in Virginia, to settle within her bounds for many years; and Presbyterianism became extinct in that State until revived again, about the year 1748, by the Rev. Samuel Davies, of precious memory in Virginia, who became the second founder of Presbyterianism there. If life shall be spared, we promise ourselves the pleasure of giving an account of Presbyterianism under his labors, which will be equally interesting, and for which we have more ample materials, and documents more abundant and satisfactory.

But the Rev. Nathaniel Taylor has been forgotten for some time, and we left him without a congregation, as the Marlborough congregation had no existence in his day. He died soon after Makemie, but there are no means of knowing the precise time of his death. When he was settled, or from whence he came, I confess I have no means of ascertaining. But Professor Hodge will have as difficult an undertaking to prove him a

Scotchman as he would to find the colony, or their descendants, about Marlborough, and to prove there was such a Scotch congregation there, of which he was Pastor in the year 1690. Dr. Green, in his Christian Advocate, volume 8, page 467, takes this notice of Taylor: "The place where Taylor exercised his ministry, the writer has not been able satisfactorily to ascertain, nor the time of his death." Professor Hodge, in his preface, says he derived all his manuscript letters and statements, which he so often refers to, from Dr. Green; and he further states, that some one of those manuscripts, written by Dr. Balch, formerly of Georgetown, contains this strange account about the colony of two hundred Scotchmen coming over in 1690, and settling with their Minister, Mr. Nathaniel Taylor, (who was one of the original members that formed the Presbytery,) at Upper Marlborough, in Maryland. The extract just above, taken from Dr. Green's Christian Advocate, was published in the year 1830, a very short time before Dr. Balch's death in 1833. But, as I cannot have access to Professor Hodge's unpublished documents to compare dates, I am under the necessity, in answering him, of dealing somewhat in conjecture. I suppose, then, that Dr. Green must have received this manuscript statement from Dr. Balch before he wrote the paragraph I have just quoted from him. If this was the case, then, as he had in his possession minutes and documents from the old Presbytery directly in conflict with this manuscript statement respecting the Scotch congregation of Upper Marlborough, we suppose that he placed no confidence in that statement. If he received the statement after he wrote the above paragraph, then he obtained it from one superannuated and far gone in second childhood, as was well known to have been the case of that worthy old father of Georgetown a short time before his death. Yet this is the only authority, in defiance of ample testimony to the contrary, for making a Scotchman of the Rev. Nathaniel Taylor, and placing him over a Scotch congregation in Maryland as early as the year 1690.

Although we cannot fix with certainty where Mr. Taylor was settled, there are circumstances affording strong presumptive evidence that his location was somewhere on the borders of the Delaware river, either east or west of it.

1. We have seen that extensive purchases were at an early day made of lands upon both sides of that river by a company from Connecticut.

2. These lands were early settled by New England emigrants, and replenished from time to time by fresh settlers from the same region.

3. One of the avowed objects in forming these settlements was the forming of pure churches in that region, according to the model in use by these adventurers.

4. Missionaries were constantly sent to those settlements and the circumjacent regions by the churches of New England—and what is worthy of notice is, that we hear of missionaries visiting them from no other quarter. No Scotch or Irish missionary has ever been mentioned.

5. Wilson and Davis had lately settled in the bounds occupied by those New England settlers, and within the limits of their ancient purchase of territory. These two last mentioned Ministers had settled on the west side of the river Delaware.

6. Professor Hodge, page 44, has this admission: "Some permanent settlements, however, were made upon the Jersey side of the Delaware. Fairfield, for example, was settled about 1690 by a number of persons from the town of the same name in Connecticut. This fact is ascertained from the law creating the township of Fairfield, passed in 1697. Cape May was also a Puritan settlement, of which their records contain indubitable evidence." Johnson, in his history of the churches in West Jersey, says: "The Presbyterian church of Fairfield was constituted by emigrants from Fairfield, in Connecticut, in the year 1697, who purchased that tract of land lying on the south of Cæsaria river (or Cohanzy) and the Delaware bay. It has generally been supposed that their Minister made one of their number." I have quoted Johnson, not because I suppose his statements are implicitly to be relied on—for I have found them in many instances erroneous, especially in the dates ascribed to congregations, and the order in which he ranges their respective Pastors—but in the present instance his statement perfectly agrees with that given by Professor Hodge, with this difference only, that Johnson says the church was organized at the time Professor Hodge says the township of Fairfield was created, and that the church was generally supposed to have had a Minister at the time, i. e. 1697. Here then is a church in Fairfield, West Jersey, composed of settlers from Connecticut, and within the limits purchased by that people in the year 1697—which church is said to be supplied with a Minister of the same class of people, but the name of this Minister we know not. But we find a Minister by the name of Nathaniel Taylor, about seven or eight years afterwards, who was settled somewhere in those regions, we know not where. He had a congregation, of which we know nothing, except that it was not at Upper Marlborough in Maryland. Let it be remembered that I do not say Mr. Taylor was Minister at Fairfield, for I have not sufficient evidence of the fact. Whatever may be my conjecture, I do not think it honest to give it as a historical fact without evidence sufficient to establish it.

I will add one more observation upon this subject. The minutes of the Presbytery in the year 1708—the very year that Makemie and Boyd

died, and about the time of Taylor's death—state that a "Mr. Joseph Smith was ordained and settled as the Pastor of Cohanzy." This Cohanzy was either the same as Fairfield, or it was in the neighborhood of it, and was composed of settlers of the same character. Now, if we consult Mather's account of the graduates of Harvard College, we shall find that this Joseph Smith was a classmate of Jedediah Andrews, and graduated at the same time with him. We know then from whence the settlers between Cohanzy river and the Delaware would obtain their Ministers.

Putting all these considerations together, it is my *conjecture*—I say conjecture—that the Rev. Nathaniel Taylor was a countryman and an intimate acquaintance of Mr. Andrews, and that he was settled among the New England settlers in Fairfield, or somewhere upon the Cohanzy river, and that they were among those of whom Mr. Andrews speaks in his letter to Mr. Prince, of Boston, when he says: "In the Jerseys there are some Congregational Assemblies—that is, some of the people incline that way, being originally of New England; yet they all submit to our Presbyteries readily enough, and the Ministers are all Presbyterian, though mostly from New England." Whether, therefore, there is most probability in my mere *conjecture*, or in Professor Hodge's *confident and reiterated assertions*, I shall now leave with the reader to form his own opinion.

We have now learned all we are likely to know respecting five out of the seven members who bore a part in forming the first Presbytery in America. Makemie, Hampton, and McNish, three Irish Ministers, were sent out as missionaries by a Union of Presbyterian and Congregational Ministers, which was formed in and about London. This Union, which had been under consideration for a year or two, was finished and published in the spring of the year 1691. These three were all Presbyterians—not one of them a Scotch Presbyterian—but liberal, tolerant, Irish Presbyterians, upon the plan of English Presbyterianism in the day of William III, Prince of Orange, who first granted liberty of conscience and religious freedom, without distinction of sect or denomination, to his subjects generally. Against this Act of Toleration the Kirk of Scotland has uniformly been opposed, and bearing their testimony whenever occasion would serve. See all about this matter in the Rev. John Willison's "Fair and Impartial Testimony." It will there appear what a tremendous evil our Scotch Presbyterians thought the Act of Toleration—what fearful consequences they expected to follow it, and what frequent and doleful testimonies they bore against that bane of their divinely constituted form of Presbyterian government. But Makemie, with his Irish brethern, thought and felt differently. They could cheerfully shelter themselves under the protection of that act of indulgence, and they could act with the United Brethren of

London, who had met upon the half-way ground between a rigid Presbytery and loose Independency, in spreading the Gospel through the destitute American Colonies. They did not think that some of the minutiæ of the form of church government, or the mode of exercising discipline, were of such essential and vital importance that they could not co-operate with those who thought differently from themselves upon some of these minor points in proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ to a perishing world. Such men were our venerable Makemie, Hampton, and McNish. As to Andrews, Makemie's intimate friend and coadjutor in organizing the Presbytery, he was universally acknowledged to have been a Congregationalist from Boston. But he and others of his brethern were willing to drop the name of Congregationalist and be called Presbyterian, "*and they could all submit to the Presbytery readily enough, though mostly from New England.*" From whence came Mr. Nathaniel Taylor, or where he was located, is still involved in uncertainty. One thing about him is certain, that there is not a particle of evidence, worthy of credit, to prove that he was a Scotchman.

It remains that we next inquire respecting the remaining two original members, Wilson and Davis. It is perplexing to have to investigate accounts where there is such a want of evidence, such gratuitous assumptions, such positive and confident assertions, and such contradictory statements. As a sample of these things, take the following from Dr. Green's statement in the Christian Advocate, vol. 8th, page 466. After enumerating the names of the seven original members, he says: "Of these men, it is known that Mr. Andrews was from New England—the rest were unquestionably foreigners by birth, chiefly emigrants from Scotland and Ireland. Andrews, *it appears*, was ordained in Philadelphia, either before the Presbytery was regularly constituted or immediately afterwards; and the others, *no doubt*, had received ordination previously to their coming to America. *No authentic accounts, however, have been obtained of the precise time at which they arrived in this country, nor of the special motives which caused their emigration.*"

It is painful to have to criticise such a paragraph as this, especially as coming from the pen of so venerable and estimable a man as its author certainly is. But as such statements, coming from such a source, are calculated to mislead the uninformed, and no doubt did mislead our young Princeton Professor, a sacred regard to truth, as an honest historian, compels me to point out some of the unwarranted assumptions and glaring absurdities and contradictions contained in this short quotation.

1. Mark this expression, "*the rest* [except Andrews] *were unquestionably foreigners by birth, chiefly from Scotland and Ireland.*" How

came this to be such an unquestionable matter of fact? Was it attended with such clear and abundant evidence? If so, why was not that evidence produced? It has been and still is denied, and proof has been again and again called for, and these calls have always been met by a repetition of the same round assertion, that it is unquestionably so. Doctor Green has frequently repeated it, and Professor Hodge rings the changes upon it.

2. "*Andrews*, [he says,] *it appears*, was ordained in Philadelphia, either before the Presbytery was regularly constituted or immediately afterwards." I ask, how does this fact *appear?* If there was evidence of it, why was *it* not made *to appear* whether it was before the Presbytery was regularly constituted or afterwards? What is meant by the Presbytery's being regularly constituted? Did it exist irregularly as a Presbytery before its constitution? If so, how long? in what state? and how does all this appear? "*Andrews was ordained in Philadelphia.*" Now the truth is, after all this loose kind of writing, Mr. Andrews was not ordained at Philadelphia at all, but came as an ordained Minister from Boston, and both Cotton Mather and Doctor Mease establish this fact beyond the power of contradiction, as has been already proved.

3. If Doctor Green or Professor Hodge were so assured *that all these members alluded to were foreigners by birth*, chiefly emigrants from Scotland and Ireland, why did they not let it be known how they got this information, and then tell us which of those foreigners came from Scotland, which from Ireland, and which from some other country? for the word *chiefly* implies there were some of them that formed exceptions. What unguarded writing is this?

4. But the greatest absurdity, if not flat contradiction, in this short quotation, is this: "No authentic accounts, however, have been obtained of the precise time at which they [these foreigners, chiefly from Scotland and Ireland] arrived in this country, nor of the special motives which caused their emigration." It is passing strange that the evidence, which would "*make it appear*" that some of these venerable fathers and founders of Presbyterianism in America came from other regions, but chiefly from Scotland and Ireland, should fail to give any intimation at what time they arrived, or of what brought them to this country at all. When the pride of commitment or the spirit of party takes possession even of venerable and good men, it is wonderful to see to what lengths it will carry them, and when stronger arguments fail, with what "*supplemental shifts*" they will sometimes satisfy themselves.

We shall now see by what arguments Professor Hodge undertakes to prove that both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Davis were good sound Scotch Presbyterians.

First, respecting Mr. Wilson, who was settled at Newcastle, and preached part of his time at Whiteclay creek and Apoquinimi. I will begin by noticing a little discrepancy between Doctor Green and Professor Hodge respecting the death of Mr. Wilson. Doctor Green says, page 467, that Wilson died in the year 1711; but Professor Hodge says, page 90, he died in 1708. Did their unquestionable sources of information differ, or did they write loosely? In the same page Professor Hodge says: "That he [Wilson] was from Scotland may be inferred, not only from the place of his labors and his associates, but from his being appointed to conduct the correspondence with that country. It was natural that those members of the Presbytery who came from Scotland or Ireland, should be designated to write, as occasion required, to the places from whence they came. This natural rule, it is evident from the minutes, was actually adopted. Mr. Andrews was the great penman of the Presbytery, and, as he lived in Philadelphia and kept the books, a great part of the burden of conducting the correspondence of the body, which was no slight matter, was devolved upon him. Yet, *it is believed*, there is no instance in the early minutes of his being appointed to write to either Scotland or Ireland. This duty was assigned to Makemie, Wilson, Anderson, Gillespie, and Henry." In a note, he quotes from the minutes appointments in accordance with his rule, as, for example, "Ordered, that Mr. Makemie write to Scotland." Query. Has he proved that Makemie came from Scotland? "All these [says he] are known to have been Scotch or Irish; it is hardly to be doubted, as there is not the slightest evidence to the contrary, that Wilson was also."

But let us now see how Professor Hodge's rule, by which he means to prove that Mr. Wilson was a Scotchman, will work. The following is an extract from the minutes, to which he so confidently appeals, saying *there is no instance in the early minutes of Mr. Andrews being appointed to write to either Scotland or Ireland.* "March 26th. Post preces siderunt ye Moderator, &c. Ordered by the Presbytery, that Mr. Andrews and Mr. Makemie write to Scotland to Mr. Alexander Colden, of Oxnam," &c. Query. Ought not our Professor to have been more careful how he wrote? Again: When he lays down a rule to establish a fact, ought he not to be sure that his rule will not work both ways? Here our Professor has proved that both Andrews and Makemie were Scotchmen. An argument, therefore, which proves too much, proves nothing. And, as this is his only argument to prove that Mr. Wilson came from Scotland, Professor Hodge has as completely failed in this attempt as he did before in proving that Nathaniel Taylor was a Scotchman. So he has produced no evidence that, of the six original members whose cases we have examined, there was one Scotchman amongst them.

We have but one more case to examine—that of Mr. Samuel Davis, who was settled somewhere in the region of country lying about Lewistown, in Delaware, and the Maryland line. But over what congregation he served as Pastor, or whether any one was at that time organized in that region, we are not informed; but Professor Hodge is determined to make a Scotchman *of him* also. We shall now see how he goes about it.

Page 89: "It is probable [says he] that the Rev. Samuel Davis was another of the Ministers whom Mr. Makemie, during his visit to Europe, induced to come to this country. The scene of his labors, from 1705 or 1706 onwards, was the churches planted by Makemie, or those in their immediate vicinity. He was appointed to take part in the installation of Mr. Hampton at Snowhill, in connexion with Mr. McNish, and subsequently he was associated with Mr. Hampton and Mr. Henry.* He finally succeeded Mr. Hampton as Minister of Snowhill. All these circumstances connect him with the churches in the peninsula, all of whose Ministers—Makemie, Hampton, McNish, Henry, Clement, Steward, Thomson—were from Scotland or Ireland. *If Davis was not, he is the only exception.* In the absence of all evidence to the contrary, or of any circumstance connecting him with New England, it is in the highest degree probable that he had the same origin with his associates."

We have before shown that Professor Hodge does not always ascribe the same origin to all these eastern shore Ministers. There is no evidence that Davis had any connexion with any of the churches which Makemie had organized, before he succeeded Mr. Hampton at Snowhill, after his removal, which was some years after he resided in what is now called the State of Delaware. Merely because he lived and labored in a part of the peninsula in which some Ministers had lived, or were living, part of whom came from Ireland and part from South Britain, to infer that Mr. Davis was a Scotchman, may truly be called a violent presumption. And even if he had succeeded in proving that Mr. Davis came from Ireland, it would have gone but little way to have established the point he was mainly aiming at, that he brought over with him strict, intolerant, Divine right Scotch Presbyterianism; for if he is to be associated with Makemie, Hampton, McNish, and Henry, and it be admitted that these Ministers were sent over to America by the United Brethren of London, would he be any nearer

* I can but notice a note our Professor here introduces. He says: "Mr. Spence, page 70, speaks of Mr. Hampton as coming from Ireland. But Doctor Rodgers, of New York, and other Ministers of our church, of the last generation, always spoke of him as a Scotchman." He fights hard for a Scotchman. His will be a hard case if he should fail in producing one, in all their number, after all. Now Davis is his last chance.

proving that he possessed the rigid Scotch principles, than he would be in proving him to be a Scotchman? But the mode of arguing by which he undertakes to arrive at his conclusion is certainly a novel one in the art of reasoning. First to assert, without proof, that Mr. Davis had the same origin with his associates, and then, if evidence to the contrary cannot be produced, the conclusion to be drawn from it is, that if his associates were of Scottish or Irish origin, Mr. Davis was of the same. This looks too much like trifling with a grave and weighty subject.

We have now examined the case of all seven of the original members of the first Presbytery. Three of them we know to have been Irish clergymen of liberal and tolerant principles. One a Congregationalist, but of a very conciliating temper and catholic principles. Of the other three we have no certain information respecting their origin, but strong presumptive evidence that they had been educated as Congregationalists—arising from the places where they settled, the kind of population of which their congregations were formed, the liberal and tolerant government they practised, and last, though not least, the peace and harmony which prevailed among them, until about twenty or thirty years afterwards, when a large number of what were then called *new-comers* settled among them, and united with them in their ecclesiastical connexion, and introduced principles of government and discipline which the original members, and those likeminded with them, were very unwilling to submit to. One thing is certain, notwithstanding the bold and repeated assertions to the contrary—that if there was a solitary member from Scotland among them, it has yet to be proved, and proved against the strongest circumstantial evidence to the contrary. To suppose that *Scotch* and *Irish* Presbyterians are synonymous terms is a great mistake, for the two nations were governed by very different laws, both civil and ecclesiastical. And whatever might be the case with other Irish Ministers, it is certain that those who were sent out by the London Union were very different from the rigid and uncompromising Presbyterians of Scotland.

The Mother Presbytery could not have been formed before the fall of 1705, for it was late in March, 1705, when Makemie and his Irish associates arrived in America. The minutes of part of a meeting held October 27th, 1706, are preserved, and must have been written on the second page, for the next page is distinctly marked as the third, and gives an account of two meetings which were held in the year 1707. If there were not two meetings held in 1706, (and it is possible this was the case, since two were held the ensuing year,) Mr. Boyd, who was ordained October 29, 1706, must have joined the Presbytery and commenced his trials at the first meeting that was held. Who Mr. Boyd was, and whence he came, we

know not. Professor Hodge claims him as a Scotchman; but what credit is due to such claims from our Professor, or to such unpublished manuscripts as he has had the exclusive privilege of culling from, we have already seen. Mr. Boyd lived but two years after his ordination, and could have had but little influence in giving character to the church, no matter from what part of the world he came.

The character assumed and practised upon at first, by this new American Presbytery, may be easily conjectured, after what has been said respecting the materials of which it was composed. That it was a system of compromise as to government and discipline is susceptible of abundant proof, and will be made fully to appear in a subsequent number of this work, should life and health be given to the writer. Both Doctors Green and Miller, in calm times, and before party excitement had got to such a height, admitted that the Presbytery did not at first formally adopt any regular system of church government, and that their plan was rather implied than expressed. I think these venerable and respected brethren were then more likely to form a correct opinion upon this subject, than since they have probably become heated with controversy and prominently committed to a party. But we expect to do more justice to this subject in the sequel. Although the Presbytery had adopted exclusively no particular system, yet Presbyterianism predominated in their acts, as well as in giving it the name; and if that master-spirit and father of the church, Makemie, had lived a few years longer to have nursed and governed it with his conciliating spirit and persuasive manner, it would probably have soon become more thoroughly and uniformly Presbyterian in its character. That he was in principle and preference a Presbyterian, I have no doubt—but not an exclusive sectarian Presbyterian according to the intolerant system of Scotland. He believed the office of Ruling Elder was founded in Scripture and profitable to the church, and no doubt practised accordingly, when practicable, and wished to see others likeminded. But he did not attach such importance to the name, as to think it would deserve a high degree of censure, if a man, instead of being called Ruling Elder, should be called an "*assistant*," and would perform the same duties under that name. Nor, if the same duties were performed and assistance rendered by one who was called a *Deacon*, and took care of the temporalities of the church, would he have thought it a matter of vital importance. Nor would he have judged, if this service had been rendered by one under the name of Committee-man, or any other name, though he had undergone no other investiture of office than *an election to it* and a declaration of *acceptance of it*, without adopting or subscribing a confession of faith and particular form of government, that this would have vitiated all connected with it, and deserved excision from the

church. Nor did he believe that all who could not subscribe to the Divine authority of Ruling Elders, or make use of that office, ought to be unchurched. The fact is, that all such matters were merely circumstantials or non-essentials in religion, in the estimation of these men, which might be tolerated without forfeiting Christian character. There were churches in connexion with the Mother Presbytery which did not make use of Ruling Elders, and they were known to be such, without incurring censure or being subjected to the discipline of the church. Neither was any confession of faith adopted or subscribed, by members admitted to communion, or Ministers at their ordination, for a number of years; and when the confession of faith was adopted, it was done in such a manner, and under such circumstances, as left the members in possession of the liberty of their own consciences and private judgment, in what they did not believe was agreeable to the Word of God.

In order to contrast this liberal and conciliating policy with the strict and rigid system which was in force in Scotland at this very time, I advise all my readers who would be well informed upon this subject, to read at large Willison's "Fair and Impartial Testimony," which will give a full portraiture of it. But, as many may not have access to that book, which has now become a scarce one, I shall have to give a few extracts at present, my limits admitting no more. The edition I use was printed at Pittsburgh in 1808, by Zadok Cramer.

Page 76, and onward: "The church being most earnest to oppose this toleration,† and other grievances then coming upon the church, they sent three of their number, Masters Carstares, Blackwall, and Baillie, to London to present this and other of their petitions, and to *agent* the church's cause: but, notwithstanding all that, this and other acts *were passed against the church.* All Episcopal Ministers were allowed to preach, pray, administer the sacraments, and marry, without any other caveat that appears, for their doctrine, save *that they shall not deny in their preaching or writing the doctrine of the blessed Trinity.*" Willison further says: "We do here *join with the church* in testifying against such a *boundless toleration*, as being contrary to the Word of God, and the practice of reforming magistrates and churches therein commended, as in 2d Chron. 34th 33, Rev. 2d 2; and tot hese texts wherein such a toleration is reproved, as Rev. 2d 14, 15, 20; as also it is contrary to our confession of faith, chapter 23d, and to our larger catechism upon the second commandment." See also page 79: "And though the Church of Scot-

* This refers to the Act of Toleration passed by William, Prince of Orange, in 1689, and these steps were taken by the Kirk during Queen Anne's reign, in the year 1712.

land hath an equal security, in a legal establishment with that of England, yet there is a vast inequality as to the toleration of the respective Dissenters. In Scotland, the toleration doth not restrain the disseminating the most dangerous errors, by requiring a confession of faith, or subscription to the doctrinal articles of the Established Church, as is required of Dissenters in England: it also weakeneth the discipline of the church against the scandalous and profane, by withdrawing the concurrence of the civil magistrate." Again, page 90: "Alas! how little ground have we, in an ordinary way, to expect any national reviving, or reformation in the church and land, while the floodgates of error and corruption are still kept wide open by the laws for toleration and patronages."

The next quotation to be given is a remarkable one, on two accounts; first, it is directed against Independents or Congregationalists; and, secondly, it relates to events which occurred about the very time *the newcomers* to Pennsylvania began their disturbances about adopting the Westminster Confession of Faith in toto. From page 111: "This woful contempt and disregard of the flock of Christ, by intruding pastors upon them, neglecting their petitions, and otherwise, could not but be very provoking to a holy God; wherefore he was pleased to visit this church with several awful rebukes, and particularly with violent attacks upon her *beautiful constitution*, running it down, and promoting *Independent* schemes of government, and setting up new models of Congregational churches with new improvements.* This was first attempted by Mr. John Glas, Minister at Tealing, and Mr. Francis Archbald, Minister of Guthrie. After a time of more secret management, they came at length to vent their principles openly, and go about preaching them in the streets, fields, &c. and printed several pamphlets in favor of their new opinions. They found fault with our *confession of faith and formula*, and refused to subscribe them. They maintained that there was no warrant *for National churches under the New Testament, but only for Congregational; that single congregations are not subject to any superior judicatory, nor censurable by them; that they may ordain their own Pastors, and that all the members have a right to govern.* That the church of Israel was but a typical church, and their kings were ecclesiastical officers; that their national covenanting with God was typical, and not to be imitated by Christian nations; that *our* national covenanting was unwarrantable, and is not obligatory on us; that our martyrs who suffered for adhering to our covenants

* This occurred after the Union had been formed between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in London, and while it was in full force and operation in England and America.

were so far unenlightened; that Christian magistrates have no more power in religious matters than others, and ought not to employ their power to advance religion, to make laws with penalties in favor of it, nor to restrain or punish heretics or false teachers, nor to give encouragement to good Christians more than other good subjects; that the Christian religion ought not to be defended by arms; that the example of the reforming kings of Judah in punishing idolatry and false worship, or in encouraging true religion, is not to be imitated. These, and a great many other new and strange doctrines they spread; and would by no means be reclaimed, nor forbear venting them. At length the church did process them both, for their singular doctrines and practices. It was the opinion of many, that seeing they were both very pious men, acting according to their light, and had been, and might be further useful in the church, they should not be severely dealt with, but only brought under prohibitions and restraints; and if they could be engaged to stay with their own congregations, and no more to spread their new opinions, they might be connived at. Likewise many had greater sympathy with Mr. Archbald than with the other, in regard he was led off by him in his simplicity to these new things, neither did he vent himself so against our covenants as he did. But seeing neither of them would promise to forbear, they were both suspended; and, upon their contemning the church's sentence, they were afterwards deposed. Yet the church showed much regard to both of them; for some time after they took off the sentences, and reposed [i. e. replaced] them both in the ministry in general, though not in their churches. They did all they could to shake the Established Church government, by setting up Independent churches in several places of the land, and ordaining several mechanics and illiterate persons to be their Ministers; and they preached and wrote for Independency, but their pamphlets are confuted—*the Divine right of Presbytery established*—and the absurdities of the Independent scheme laid open by Mr. Aytone, in his *Original Constitution of the Christian Church*, and by several others; so that we need add no more to what is already written, but our approbation thereof."

Before I lose sight of this quotation, I will just make a remark or two upon it. 1. Can Professor Hodge now "*find any difficulty* to know what is meant when it is said, 'The Presbyterian systems of the French Huguenots and of South Britain were much more mild than those of Holland and Scotland, where they had the civil authority to protect them and to enforce their enactments?' Such remarks [says he] are frequently made."*

* See Professor Hodge's work, pp. 14, 15, containing a quotation from my sketch, No. 7.

2. We learn here what the strict Scotch Presbyterians would call "*new and strange doctrines and absurdities*," and which were opposed to the Divine right of Presbytery established in Scotland; which doctrines and absurdities ought not to be tolerated, but suppressed.

3. We see also how, according to their system, it was to be done, viz: If mild and persuasive means were not sufficient, the civil magistrate had power to do it, ought to do it, and, if necessary, do it by force of arms.

4. Would not the American Presbytery have been glad to receive into their connexion such pious, good, and useful men, as these are acknowledged to have been, even by their persecutors? And might they not, with Andrews and his countrymen of Jersey, *have got along well enough with the Presbytery*, constituted, as it was, upon such liberal and tolerant principles respecting these non-essentials?

5. Would not such rigid Divine right Presbyterians, as Willison said the Scotch church was composed of at that day, have opposed such a tolerant system as was used by the American Presbytery, as opening the floodgates of error and corruption? Ought they not to have opposed the American system to have been consistent? Did they not stir up strife, contention, and division, as soon as they became connected with the American Presbytery?

6. From the peace and harmony they had at first, is it not reasonable to conclude there were none of these intolerant Scotchmen among them at their commencement?

I would have it expressly understood, *that I am not now expressing my own opinions or preferences*, but, as a faithful historian, telling matters of fact, as they occurred in the infancy of our church. If they had not adopted the best plan in all things, they evinced at least a truly Christian temper, and were free from a sectarian spirit of bigotry. They were tolerant and forbearing in spirit and in practice; and, whatever defects might be discovered in their form of government and discipline, they were sound and orthodox in doctrinal sentiments, and were particularly careful that those whom they admitted into the Ministry should be sound in the faith and free from every heretical taint as to doctrines. This is admitted on all sides; and, what is more, they were men of ardent and consistent piety, and zealous advocates for fervent and experimental religion. It is due to candor to state these facts respecting the kind of Presbyterianism first introduced into America; and if I should disapprove of some things in use among them, or even think them of dangerous tendency, I cannot think myself at liberty to suppress the truth on that account, much less to torture and wrest their minutes and proceedings, to make them appear to be what they were not, or to obtain an argument to support a favorite hypothesis, or to build up a party.

Makemie and Andrews's strong friendship and attachment to each other, and the influence these master-spirits had, the one over the Presbyterian brethren and the other over the Congregational brethren, preserved peace and harmony among those who might easily have been set to wrangling by a meddlesome, factious, sectarian bigot. After the death of Makemie and Wilson and Taylor, who all died within a short time of each other, and about four or five years after the Presbytery had been organized, their loss was seriously felt, and the Presbytery began gradually to change its character. About fifteen years after its commencement, and thenceforward for twenty years, or a little more, clergymen and private members from Scotland, and others from Ireland, who had no connexion with the London Union, and who were of a very different character from those first sent out, began to emigrate to this region in great numbers, and soon gained the ascendency in their judicatories. Then the floodgates of strife and contention were thrown wide open, which in 1741 came to an open rupture, and rent the church asunder. But these transactions must furnish materials for succeeding numbers. This number brings us only to the formation of the first Presbytery, and gives us information respecting the original members who formed it, and the genius and character of that ecclesiastical connexion which they introduced into the American Colonies, which now form these United States of America. We shall hereafter have more ample and authentic documents to go upon, drawn from an unbroken series of minutes down to the present time. We shall therefore be able to give chapter and verse for what will be advanced, and shall not be compelled to use such extensive extracts from histories and authors of various kinds; nor shall we have to deal as much in conjecture for the want of satisfactory authority. Here then we close the present number.

APPENDIX.

The following is a true copy from an old pamphlet that was published at the time when the transaction took place to which it refers, and reprinted in the city of New York, by H. Gaine, at the printing office between Fly and Meal markets, 1755; furnished by Doctor John McDowell, Philadelphia. The title page is as follows, viz:

A narrative of a new and unusual American Imprisonment of two Presbyterian Ministers, and prosecution of Mr. Francis Makemie, one of them, for preaching one sermon in the city of New York, on the 20th day of January, 1706-7.

This narrative has the following epistle to the reader:

Ingenuous Reader: You have here a specimen of the clogs and fetters with which the liberties of Dissenters are entangled in New York and Jersey government beyond any places in her Majesty's [i. e. Queen Anne's] dominions; and where the conditions and impositions required are as heavy as the ground of their separation and dissent, it is next to no liberty at all.

And what the consequences of such practices, if persisted in, will prove to such a place, where Dissenters are above twenty to one for one Churchman, and where men and money are so wanting for the defence of New York, both by sea and land, which not many years (by demands of men and money from the neighboring colonies on the continent) was represented as their own barrier and frontier, I leave to thinking men and considering politicians to answer; besides the difficulties and discouragements laid in the way to promote deserters from the provinces.

I cannot omit a true and strange story I lately heard of; that during the imprisonment of these two gentlemen, either to find out a crime, none being specified in the mittimus, or to aggravate their imaginary faults, an order was given to Major Sandford, of East Jersey, to put sundry persons upon examination and their oaths, to discover what discourse they had with sundry of their friends at the house of Mr. Jasper Crane, in Newark town in East Jersey, where Mr. Samuel Melyen, Mr. Crane, and another gave their depositions before Major Sandford, but found nothing to their purpose; though the practice is not to be outdone, yea, scarce paralleled by the Spanish Inquisition, for no men are safe in their most private conver-

sations, if most intimate friends can be compelled, upon oath, to betray one another's secrets. If this is agreeable to the English constitution and privileges, I confess we have been hitherto in the dark.

Preaching in a private house was a crime, and preaching since, after being declared not guilty by a legal trial, in a public church allowed by law to the French, is since resented as a greater, by that unchristian clamor made soon after by some high-flown sparks—pretended sons of the church—who, with a great deal of unbounded fury, declared that if such things were allowed their church was ruined. Which is a language of the same nature of these high-flyers in England, who were declared by a vote of the House of Lords enemies to the Queen and Government, for suggesting the church was in danger from the liberty or toleration of Dissenters.

Though preaching a sermon and printing it, as the cause of imprisonment, be reputed a libel, to justify opening of letters and seizing books without restoration or satisfaction, I hope it will be no crime for losers to speak in telling the world what we have suffered on sundry accounts; not only by imprisonment and the exorbitant and expensive prosecution, and, besides great loss of time, many diminutive reproaches upon our reputations, by a set of men who could reach by their short horns to no higher degree of persecution; and all this for preaching one sermon without obtaining license, which they could not *in terminis* submit to, neither can, nor dare in conscience do, to this day. And even for such as have this new-moulded license, it is a crime to preach in another place than is expressed in said license, or for any to preach in their pulpits. If a people want a Minister, they must have a license to call one, whether from New England or Europe; a license to admit Ministers to attend any ordination, and limited for number, and tied up from exercising their ministry without license, though in a transient manner, which has drove some out of the government, and deterred others from coming thereunto; which informs all what liberty of conscience Dissenters do enjoy.

Mr. Makemie, since the trial, narrowly escaped a second prosecution for preaching another sermon, and, as some say, with a new charge of being the author of the Jersey paper called "Forget and Forgive;" which is so groundless a charge, in which his accusers cannot believe themselves, while the authors smile at the mistake, and other men are suffering imprisonment on account of the said paper, and which will appear to have been composed before Mr. Makemie came into these parts.

This narrative consists chiefly of these parts of matter: 1st. Their precepts for their apprehending and commitment. 2d. Sundry petitions. 3d. The interlocutory conference promoted and extorted from Makemie. 4th. Copies of records attested by Mr. Secretary. 5th. The pleadings of the

defendant and lawyers, with some intermixed animadversions and glosses upon these as the text. If the publisher is mistaken in his sense of things, he is under the correction of all judicious, impartial, and unprejudiced persons, whom he readily submits unto.

If any want information concerning the sufferings of other Dissenters, both in their persons, estates, and religious liberties, I recommend them to the body of the inhabitants of Jamaica and Newtown on Long Island, and Bedford in Westchester. The former afraid to petition, though one of them has a Minister by a *during-pleasure license;* and the late petition of Bedford, for calling a Minister, is not yet answered, until an abdicated Scotch Jacobite Parson obtruded upon them, that insults intolerably over them, is consulted with. And how consistent such things are, even with liberty of conscience, enjoined and commanded to be allowed by the Queen's instructions produced in court, and to be found in this narrative, I leave to every reader to determine. So I bid you farewell.

A Learner of the Law and a Lover of Liberty.

Here follows now the narrative itself, printed correctly from the pamphlet:

There is nothing more common in Europe than publishing and printing most trials, especially such as afford any thing remarkable, either from the merit of the cause or the manner of the prosecution. And there being something singular and extraordinary in sundry respects in the cause now before us, we cannot—we dare not—be silent at this juncture, but are bound to let both Europe and America know the first prosecution of this nature that ever was in America; which we hope, from the merits of the cause, manner, and proceeding, and its unsuccessfulness, will never be drawn into precedent in our quiet and peaceable wilderness.

And though there was a disappointment in taking an exact copy, at the time, of every thing offered at the trial, and so no formal nor strictly accurate trial can be expected, especially from one who is no lawyer, but only a brief narrative and genuine history of the several steps of sufferings by the confinement of Francis Makemie and John Hampton, Presbyterian Ministers, for preaching two sermons in the Government of New York without license being first obtained from Lord Carnbury for so doing. The former, upon the earnest request of certain persons in the city of New York, preached a sermon at the house of William Jackson, in Pearl street, on the 20th day of January, 1806-7, in as public a manner as possible, with open doors, which sermon is since printed, which he was necessitated to do, seeing Lord Carnbury opposed his preaching in the Dutch church; and the latter preached a sermon on the same day in a public meeting-house, offered to record by the inhabitants of Newtown upon Long Island.

And Mr. Makemie remained at York city all Monday and a part of Tuesday, the 22d of January, and travelled that day to Newtown on Long Island, where, according to public appointment on the Lord's day, he was designed to preach on Wednesday following; and was no sooner arrived there, but both were apprehended by Thomas Cardale, high sheriff, and Stephen Luff, under sheriff of Queen's county, by a warrant signed by Lord Carnbury, as follows:

Whereas I am informed that one Mackennan and one Hampton, two Presbyterian preachers who lately came to this city, have taken it upon them to preach in a private house without having obtained my license for so doing, which is directly contrary to the known laws of England: And being likewise informed that they are gone into Long Island with intent there to spread their pernicious doctrine and principles, to the great disturbance of the church by law established, and of the government of this province: You are, therefore, hereby required and commanded to take into your custody the bodies of the said Mackennan and Hampton, and them to bring with all convenient speed before me, at Fort Anne, in New York; and for so doing this shall be your sufficient warrant.

Given under my hand, at Fort Anne, this 21st day of January, 1706-7.

CARNBURY.

To Thomas Cardale, Esq., High Sheriff
of Queen's county, on Long Island, or his deputy.

A true copy: Examined per

THOMAS CARDALE.

And being late when apprehended, they were prisoners upon parole at the house of two neighbors for the night, and next day, instead of carrying them to Fort Anne according to the directions of said precept, they were carried by said Sheriffs to Jamaica, seven or eight miles out of their direct way to York, and there detained all that day and night, as if they were to be carried about in triumph to be insulted over as exemplary criminals, and put to further charge. The 23d day, about noon, they were carried to Fort Anne in York, and after sundry hours' attendance, appeared before Lord Carnbury in the Council Chamber about three or four o'clock, who charged them with having taken upon them to preach in his government without his license.

And in regard to the interlocutory conference upon that occasion, which continued for some time, has been misrepresented by sundry hands, and is a seasonable and suitable preliminary to the ensuing trial, it is judged expedient to publish as much thereof as was very soon committed to writing as followeth:

Lord Carnbury. How dare you take upon you to preach in my government without my license?

Mr. Makemie. We have liberty from an act of Parliament made the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary, which gave us liberty, with which law we have complied.

L. C. None shall preach in my government without my license.

F. M. If the law for liberty, my Lord, had directed us to any particular persons in authority for license, we would readily have observed the same; but we cannot find any directions in said act of Parliament, therefore we could not take notice thereof.

L. C. That law does not extend to the American Plantations, but only to England.

F. M. My Lord, I humbly conceive it is not a limited nor local act; and am well assured it extends to other plantations of the Queen's dominions, which is evident from certificates from courts of record of Virginia and Maryland, certifying we have complied with said law.

Both these certificates were produced, and read by Lord Carnbury; who was pleased to say, these certificates extended not to New York.

L. C. I know it is local and limited, for I was at the making thereof.

F. M. Your Excellency might be at the making thereof; but we are well assured there is no such *limiting clause* therein as is in local acts, and desire that the law may be produced to determine this point.

L. C. *Turning to Mr. Attorney, Mr. Bekely, who was present, and asketl him*, Is it not so, Mr. Attorney?

Mr. Attorney. Yes it is local, my Lord, *and producing an argument for it*, further said, that all the penal laws were local and limited, and did not extend to the plantations; and the Act of Toleration being made to take off the edge of the penal laws, therefore the Act of Toleration does not extend to any plantations.

F. M. I desire the law may be produced, for I am morally persuaded *there is no limitation or restriction* in the law to England, Wales, and Berwick on Tweed; for it extends to sundry plantations of the Queen's dominions, as Barbadoes, Virginia, and Maryland, which was evident from the certificates produced, which we could not have obtained if the act of Parliament had not extended to the plantations.* And Mr. Makemie further said, that he presumed New York was a part of her Majesty's dominions also; and that sundry Ministers on the east end of Long Island

* This proves that Mr. Makemie had labored as a Minister in Barbadoes before he came to Virginia, and had qualified himself for so doing according to the Act of Toleration, and had with him his certificate. He left an organized congregation of Dissenters in that Island, which existed long afterwards, and received supplies both from New England and the Presbytery of Philadelphia, after its formation.

had complied with said law, and qualified themselves at court by complying with the directions of said law, and have no license from your Lordship.

L. C. Yes, New York is of her Majesty's dominions; but the Act of Toleration does not extend to the plantations by its own intrinsic virtue, or any intention of the legislators, but only *by her Majesty's instructions* signified unto me, and that is from *her prerogative and clemency;* and the courts which have qualified these men are in an error, and I will check them for it.

F. M. If the law extends to the plantations any manner of way, whether by the Queen's prerogative, clemency, or otherwise, our certificates were a demonstration that we had complied therewith.

L. C. These certificates were only for Virginia and Maryland; they did not extend to New York.

F. M. We presume, my Lord, our certificates do extend as far as the law extends; for we are directed by the act of Parliament to qualify ourselves in the places where we live, which we have done; and the same law directs us *to take certificates of our qualification*, which we have also done; and these certificates are not to certify to such as behold us taking our qualifications, being performed in the face of the country at a public court; but our certificates must be to satisfy others abroad in the world, who saw it not nor heard any thing of it, otherwise it were needless. And that law which obliges us to take a certificate, must allow said certificate to have a credit and a reputation in her Majesty's dominions; otherwise it is to no purpose.

L. C. That act of Parliament was made against *strolling Preachers*, and you are such, and shall not preach in my government.

F. M. There is not one word, my Lord, mentioned in any part of the law against *travelling* or *strolling Preachers*, as your Excellency is pleased to call them; and we are to judge that to be the true end of the law which is specified in the preamble thereof, which is *for the satisfaction of scrupulous consciences and uniting the subjects of England in interest and affection.* And it is well known, my Lord, to all, that Quakers, who also have liberty by this law, have few or no fixed Teachers, but are chiefly taught by such as *travel*, and it is known to all that such are sent forth by the yearly meeting at London, and travel and teach over the plantations, and are not molested.

L. C. I have troubled some of them, and will trouble them more.

F. M. We hear, my Lord, one of them was prosecuted at Jamaica, but it was not for *travelling and teaching*, but *for particulars in teaching*, for which he suffered.

L. C. *You shall not spread your pernicious doctrines here.*

F. M. *As to our doctrines*, my Lord, we have our *confession of faith*, which is known to the Christian world, and I challenge all the clergy of York to shew us any false or pernicious doctrines therein; yea, with those exceptions specified in the law, we are able to make it appear that they are, in all doctrinal articles of faith, agreeable to *the established doctrines of the Church of England.*

L. C. There is one thing wanting in your certificates, and that is, signing the articles of the Church of England.

F. M. That is the Clerk's omission, my Lord, for which we are no way accountable, by not being full and more particular; but if we had not complied with the whole law, in all the parts thereof, we should not have had certificates pursuant to said act of Parliament. And your Lordship may be assured that we have done nothing in complying with said law but what we are still ready to perform, if your Lordship require it, and that ten times over. And as to the *articles of religion*, I have a copy in my pocket, and am ready at all times to sign, *with those exceptions specified in the law.**

L. C. You preached in a private house, not certified according to act of Parliament.

F. M. There were endeavors used for my preaching in a more public place, and (though without my knowledge) your Lordship's permission was demanded for my preaching in the Dutch Church, and being denied, we were under a necessity of assembling for public worship in a private house, which we did *in as public a manner* as possible, *with open doors:* and we are directed to certify the same to the next Quarter Sessions, which cannot be done until the Quarter Sessions come in course, for the law binds no man to impossibilities; and if we do not certify to the next Quarter Sessions, we shall be culpable, but not till then. For it is evident, my Lord, that this act of Parliament was made and passed the Royal assent May 24th, and it being some time before the Quarter Sessions came in course, and all Ministers in England continued to preach without one day's cessation or forbearance; and we hope the practice of England should be a precedent for America.

L. C. None shall preach in my government without my license, as the Queen has signified to me, by her royal instructions.

* The excepted articles which Dissenters were not required to sign are: the 34th, concerning Ecclesiastical Traditions; the 35th, concerning the Homilies; and the 36th, concerning the Consecration of Bishops and Ministers; together with this clause in the 20th article, viz: "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith, and yet."

2. We learn here what the strict Scotch Presbyterians would call "*new and strange doctrines and absurdities*," and which were opposed to the Divine right of Presbytery established in Scotland; which doctrines and absurdities ought not to be tolerated, but suppressed.

3. We see also how, according to their system, it was to be done, viz: If mild and persuasive means were not sufficient, the civil magistrate had power to do it, ought to do it, and, if necessary, do it by force of arms.

4. Would not the American Presbytery have been glad to receive into their connexion such pious, good, and useful men, as these are acknowledged to have been, even by their persecutors? And might they not, with Andrews and his countrymen of Jersey, *have got along well enough with the Presbytery*, constituted, as it was, upon such liberal and tolerant principles respecting these non-essentials?

5. Would not such rigid Divine right Presbyterians, as Willison said the Scotch church was composed of at that day, have opposed such a tolerant system as was used by the American Presbytery, as opening the floodgates of error and corruption? Ought they not to have opposed the American system to have been consistent? Did they not stir up strife, contention, and division, as soon as they became connected with the American Presbytery?

6. From the peace and harmony they had at first, is it not reasonable to conclude there were none of these intolerant Scotchmen among them at their commencement?

I would have it expressly understood, *that I am not now expressing my own opinions or preferences*, but, as a faithful historian, telling matters of fact, as they occurred in the infancy of our church. If they had not adopted the best plan in all things, they evinced at least a truly Christian temper, and were free from a sectarian spirit of bigotry. They were tolerant and forbearing in spirit and in practice; and, whatever defects might be discovered in their form of government and discipline, they were sound and orthodox in doctrinal sentiments, and were particularly careful that those whom they admitted into the Ministry should be sound in the faith and free from every heretical taint as to doctrines. This is admitted on all sides; and, what is more, they were men of ardent and consistent piety, and zealous advocates for fervent and experimental religion. It is due to candor to state these facts respecting the kind of Presbyterianism first introduced into America; and if I should disapprove of some things in use among them, or even think them of dangerous tendency, I cannot think myself at liberty to suppress the truth on that account, much less to torture and wrest their minutes and proceedings, to make them appear to be what they were not, or to obtain an argument to support a favorite hypothesis, or to build up a party.

Makemie and Andrews's strong friendship and attachment to each other, and the influence these master-spirits had, the one over the Presbyterian brethren and the other over the Congregational brethren, preserved peace and harmony among those who might easily have been set to wrangling by a meddlesome, factious, sectarian bigot. After the death of Makemie and Wilson and Taylor, who all died within a short time of each other, and about four or five years after the Presbytery had been organized, their loss was seriously felt, and the Presbytery began gradually to change its character. About fifteen years after its commencement, and thenceforward for twenty years, or a little more, clergymen and private members from Scotland, and others from Ireland, who had no connexion with the London Union, and who were of a very different character from those first sent out, began to emigrate to this region in great numbers, and soon gained the ascendency in their judicatories. Then the floodgates of strife and contention were thrown wide open, which in 1741 came to an open rupture, and rent the church asunder. But these transactions must furnish materials for succeeding numbers. This number brings us only to the formation of the first Presbytery, and gives us information respecting the original members who formed it, and the genius and character of that ecclesiastical connexion which they introduced into the American Colonies, which now form these United States of America. We shall hereafter have more ample and authentic documents to go upon, drawn from an unbroken series of minutes down to the present time. We shall therefore be able to give chapter and verse for what will be advanced, and shall not be compelled to use such extensive extracts from histories and authors of various kinds; nor shall we have to deal as much in conjecture for the want of satisfactory authority. Here then we close the present number.

APPENDIX.

The following is a true copy from an old pamphlet that was published at the time when the transaction took place to which it refers, and reprinted in the city of New York, by H. Gaine, at the printing office between Fly and Meal markets, 1755: furnished by Doctor John McDowell, Philadelphia. The title page is as follows, viz:

A narrative of a new and unusual American Imprisonment of two Presbyterian Ministers, and prosecution of Mr. Francis Makemie, one of them, for preaching one sermon in the city of New York, on the 20th day of January, 1706-7.

This narrative has the following epistle to the reader:

Ingenuous Reader: You have here a specimen of the clogs and fetters with which the liberties of Dissenters are entangled in New York and Jersey government beyond any places in her Majesty's [i. e. Queen Anne's] dominions; and where the conditions and impositions required are as heavy as the ground of their separation and dissent, it is next to no liberty at all.

And what the consequences of such practices, if persisted in, will prove to such a place, where Dissenters are above twenty to one for one Churchman, and where men and money are so wanting for the defence of New York, both by sea and land, which not many years (by demands of men and money from the neighboring colonies on the continent) was represented as their own barrier and frontier, I leave to thinking men and considering politicians to answer; besides the difficulties and discouragements laid in the way to promote deserters from the provinces.

I cannot omit a true and strange story I lately heard of; that during the imprisonment of these two gentlemen, either to find out a crime, none being specified in the mittimus, or to aggravate their imaginary faults, an order was given to Major Sandford, of East Jersey, to put sundry persons upon examination and their oaths, to discover what discourse they had with sundry of their friends at the house of Mr. Jasper Crane, in Newark town in East Jersey, where Mr. Samuel Melyen, Mr. Crane, and another gave their depositions before Major Sandford, but found nothing to their purpose; though the practice is not to be outdone, yea, scarce paralleled by the Spanish Inquisition, for no men are safe in their most private conver-

sations, if most intimate friends can be compelled, upon oath, to betray one another's secrets. If this is agreeable to the English constitution and privileges, I confess we have been hitherto in the dark.

Preaching in a private house was a crime, and preaching since, after being declared not guilty by a legal trial, in a public church allowed by law to the French, is since resented as a greater, by that unchristian clamor made soon after by some high-flown sparks—pretended sons of the church —who, with a great deal of unbounded fury, declared that if such things were allowed their church was ruined. Which is a language of the same nature of these high-flyers in England, who were declared by a vote of the House of Lords enemies to the Queen and Government, for suggesting the church was in danger from the liberty or toleration of Dissenters.

Though preaching a sermon and printing it, as the cause of imprisonment, be reputed a libel, to justify opening of letters and seizing books without restoration or satisfaction, I hope it will be no crime for losers to speak in telling the world what we have suffered on sundry accounts; not only by imprisonment and the exorbitant and expensive prosecution, and, besides great loss of time, many diminutive reproaches upon our reputations, by a set of men who could reach by their short horns to no higher degree of persecution; and all this for preaching one sermon without obtaining license, which they could not *in terminis* submit to, neither can, nor dare in conscience do, to this day. And even for such as have this new-moulded license, it is a crime to preach in another place than is expressed in said license, or for any to preach in their pulpits. If a people want a Minister, they must have a license to call one, whether from New England or Europe; a license to admit Ministers to attend any ordination, and limited for number, and tied up from exercising their ministry without license, though in a transient manner, which has drove some out of the government, and deterred others from coming thereunto; which informs all what liberty of conscience Dissenters do enjoy.

Mr. Makemie, since the trial, narrowly escaped a second prosecution for preaching another sermon, and, as some say, with a new charge of being the author of the Jersey paper called "Forget and Forgive;" which is so groundless a charge, in which his accusers cannot believe themselves, while the authors smile at the mistake, and other men are suffering imprisonment on account of the said paper, and which will appear to have been composed before Mr. Makemie came into these parts.

This narrative consists chiefly of these parts of matter: 1st. Their precepts for their apprehending and commitment. 2d. Sundry petitions. 3d. The interlocutory conference promoted and extorted from Makemie. 4th. Copies of records attested by Mr. Secretary. 5th. The pleadings of the

defendant and lawyers, with some intermixed animadversions and glosses upon these as the text. If the publisher is mistaken in his sense of things, he is under the correction of all judicious, impartial, and unprejudiced persons, whom he readily submits unto.

If any want information concerning the sufferings of other Dissenters, both in their persons, estates, and religious liberties, I recommend them to the body of the inhabitants of Jamaica and Newtown on Long Island, and Bedford in Westchester. The former afraid to petition, though one of them has a Minister by a *during-pleasure license;* and the late petition of Bedford, for calling a Minister, is not yet answered, until an abdicated Scotch Jacobite Parson obtruded upon them, that insults intolerably over them, is consulted with. And how consistent such things are, even with liberty of conscience, enjoined and commanded to be allowed by the Queen's instructions produced in court, and to be found in this narrative, I leave to every reader to determine. So I bid you farewell.

A Learner of the Law and a Lover of Liberty.

Here follows now the narrative itself, printed correctly from the pamphlet:

There is nothing more common in Europe than publishing and printing most trials, especially such as afford any thing remarkable, either from the merit of the cause or the manner of the prosecution. And there being something singular and extraordinary in sundry respects in the cause now before us, we cannot—we dare not—be silent at this juncture, but are bound to let both Europe and America know the first prosecution of this nature that ever was in America; which we hope, from the merits of the cause, manner, and proceeding, and its unsuccessfulness, will never be drawn into precedent in our quiet and peaceable wilderness.

And though there was a disappointment in taking an exact copy, at the time, of every thing offered at the trial, and so no formal nor strictly accurate trial can be expected, especially from one who is no lawyer, but only a brief narrative and genuine history of the several steps of sufferings by the confinement of Francis Makemie and John Hampton, Presbyterian Ministers, for preaching two sermons in the Government of New York without license being first obtained from Lord Carnbury for so doing. The former, upon the earnest request of certain persons in the city of New York, preached a sermon at the house of William Jackson, in Pearl street, on the 20th day of January, 1806-7, in as public a manner as possible, with open doors, which sermon is since printed, which he was necessitated to do, seeing Lord Carnbury opposed his preaching in the Dutch church; and the latter preached a sermon on the same day in a public meeting-house, offered to record by the inhabitants of Newtown upon Long Island.

And Mr. Makemie remained at York city all Monday and a part of Tuesday, the 22d of January, and travelled that day to Newtown on Long Island, where, according to public appointment on the Lord's day, he was designed to preach on Wednesday following; and was no sooner arrived there, but both were apprehended by Thomas Cardale, high sheriff, and Stephen Luff, under sheriff of Queen's county, by a warrant signed by Lord Carnbury, as follows:

Whereas I am informed that one Mackennan and one Hampton, two Presbyterian preachers who lately came to this city, have taken it upon them to preach in a private house without having obtained my license for so doing, which is directly contrary to the known laws of England: And being likewise informed that they are gone into Long Island with intent there to spread their pernicious doctrine and principles, to the great disturbance of the church by law established, and of the government of this province: You are, therefore, hereby required and commanded to take into your custody the bodies of the said Mackennan and Hampton, and them to bring with all convenient speed before me, at Fort Anne, in New York; and for so doing this shall be your sufficient warrant.

Given under my hand, at Fort Anne, this 21st day of January, 1706-7.

CARNBURY.

To Thomas Cardale, Esq., High Sheriff of Queen's county, on Long Island, or his deputy.

A true copy: Examined per

THOMAS CARDALE.

And being late when apprehended, they were prisoners upon parole at the house of two neighbors for the night, and next day, instead of carrying them to Fort Anne according to the directions of said precept, they were carried by said Sheriffs to Jamaica, seven or eight miles out of their direct way to York, and there detained all that day and night, as if they were to be carried about in triumph to be insulted over as exemplary criminals, and put to further charge. The 23d day, about noon, they were carried to Fort Anne in York, and after sundry hours' attendance, appeared before Lord Carnbury in the Council Chamber about three or four o'clock, who charged them with having taken upon them to preach in his government without his license.

And in regard to the interlocutory conference upon that occasion, which continued for some time, has been misrepresented by sundry hands, and is a seasonable and suitable preliminary to the ensuing trial, it is judged expedient to publish as much thereof as was very soon committed to writing as followeth:

Lord Carnbury. How dare you take upon you to preach in my government without my license?

Mr. Makemie. We have liberty from an act of Parliament made the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary, which gave us liberty, with which law we have complied.

L. C. None shall preach in my government without my license.

F. M. If the law for liberty, my Lord, had directed us to any particular persons in authority for license, we would readily have observed the same; but we cannot find any directions in said act of Parliament, therefore we could not take notice thereof.

L. C. That law does not extend to the American Plantations, but only to England.

F. M. My Lord, I humbly conceive it is not a limited nor local act; and am well assured it extends to other plantations of the Queen's dominions, which is evident from certificates from courts of record of Virginia and Maryland, certifying we have complied with said law.

Both these certificates were produced, and read by Lord Carnbury; who was pleased to say, these certificates extended not to New York.

L. C. I know it is local and limited, for I was at the making thereof.

F. M. Your Excellency might be at the making thereof; but we are well assured there is no such *limiting clause* therein as is in local acts, and desire that the law may be produced to determine this point.

L. C. *Turning to Mr. Attorney, Mr. Bekely, who was present, and askell him*, Is it not so, Mr. Attorney?

Mr. Attorney. Yes it is local, my Lord, *and producing an argument for it*, further said, that all the penal laws were local and limited, and did not extend to the plantations; and the Act of Toleration being made to take off the edge of the penal laws, therefore the Act of Toleration does not extend to any plantations.

F. M. I desire the law may be produced, for I am morally persuaded *there is no limitation or restriction* in the law to England, Wales, and Berwick on Tweed; for it extends to sundry plantations of the Queen's dominions, as Barbadoes, Virginia, and Maryland, which was evident from the certificates produced, which we could not have obtained if the act of Parliament had not extended to the plantations.* And Mr. Makemie further said, that he presumed New York was a part of her Majesty's dominions also; and that sundry Ministers on the east end of Long Island

* This proves that Mr. Makemie had labored as a Minister in Barbadoes before he came to Virginia, and had qualified himself for so doing according to the Act of Toleration, and had with him his certificate. He left an organized congregation of Dissenters in that Island, which existed long afterwards, and received supplies both from New England and the Presbytery of Philadelphia, after its formation.

had complied with said law, and qualified themselves at court by complying with the directions of said law, and have no license from your Lordship.

L. C. Yes, New York is of her Majesty's dominions; but the Act of Toleration does not extend to the plantations by its own intrinsic virtue, or any intention of the legislators, but only *by her Majesty's instructions* signified unto me, and that is from *her prerogative and clemency*; and the courts which have qualified these men are in an error, and I will check them for it.

F. M. If the law extends to the plantations any manner of way, whether by the Queen's prerogative, clemency, or otherwise, our certificates were a demonstration that we had complied therewith.

L. C. These certificates were only for Virginia and Maryland; they did not extend to New York.

F. M. We presume, my Lord, our certificates do extend as far as the law extends; for we are directed by the act of Parliament to qualify ourselves in the places where we live, which we have done; and the same law directs us *to take certificates of our qualification*, which we have also done; and these certificates are not to certify to such as behold us taking our qualifications, being performed in the face of the country at a public court; but our certificates must be to satisfy others abroad in the world, who saw it not nor heard any thing of it, otherwise it were needless. And that law which obliges us to take a certificate, must allow said certificate to have a credit and a reputation in her Majesty's dominions; otherwise it is to no purpose.

L. C. That act of Parliament was made against *strolling Preachers*, and you are such, and shall not preach in my government.

F. M. There is not one word, my Lord, mentioned in any part of the law against *travelling* or *strolling Preachers*, as your Excellency is pleased to call them; and we are to judge that to be the true end of the law which is specified in the preamble thereof, which is *for the satisfaction of scrupulous consciences and uniting the subjects of England in interest and affection*. And it is well known, my Lord, to all, that Quakers, who also have liberty by this law, have few or no fixed Teachers, but are chiefly taught by such as *travel*, and it is known to all that such are sent forth by the yearly meeting at London, and travel and teach over the plantations, and are not molested.

L. C. I have troubled some of them, and will trouble them more.

F. M. We hear, my Lord, one of them was prosecuted at Jamaica, but it was not for *travelling and teaching*, but *for particulars in teaching*, for which he suffered.

L. C. *You shall not spread your pernicious doctrines here.*

F. M. *As to our doctrines*, my Lord, we have our *confession of faith*, which is known to the Christian world, and I challenge all the clergy of York to shew us any false or pernicious doctrines therein; yea, with those exceptions specified in the law, we are able to make it appear that they are, in all doctrinal articles of faith, agreeable to *the established doctrines of the Church of England.*

L. C. There is one thing wanting in your certificates, and that is, signing the articles of the Church of England.

F. M. That is the Clerk's omission, my Lord, for which we are no way accountable, by not being full and more particular; but if we had not complied with the whole law, in all the parts thereof, we should not have had certificates pursuant to said act of Parliament. And your Lordship may be assured that we have done nothing in complying with said law but what we are still ready to perform, if your Lordship require it, and that ten times over. And as to the *articles of religion*, I have a copy in my pocket, and am ready at all times to sign, *with those exceptions specified in the law.**

L. C. You preached in a private house, not certified according to act of Parliament.

F. M. There were endeavors used for my preaching in a more public place, and (though without my knowledge) your Lordship's permission was demanded for my preaching in the Dutch Church, and being denied, we were under a necessity of assembling for public worship in a private house, which we did *in as public a manner* as possible, *with open doors:* and we are directed to certify the same to the next Quarter Sessions, which cannot be done until the Quarter Sessions come in course, for the law binds no man to impossibilities; and if we do not certify to the next Quarter Sessions, we shall be culpable, but not till then. For it is evident, my Lord, that this act of Parliament was made and passed the Royal assent May 24th, and it being some time before the Quarter Sessions came in course, and all Ministers in England continued to preach without one day's cessation or forbearance; and we hope the practice of England should be a precedent for America.

L. C. None shall preach in my government without my license, as the Queen has signified to me, by her royal instructions.

* The excepted articles which Dissenters were not required to sign are: the 34th, concerning Ecclesiastical Traditions; the 35th, concerning the Homilies; and the 36th, concerning the Consecration of Bishops and Ministers; together with this clause in the 20th article, viz: "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith, and yet."

F. M. Whatever direction the Queen's instructions may be to your Lordship, they can be no rule or law to us, nor any particular person who never saw, and perhaps never shall see them. For *promulgation is the life of the law.*

L. C. You must give bond and security for your good behavior, and also bond and security to preach no more in my government.

F. M. As to our behavior, though we have no way broke it, endeavoring always so to live "as to keep a conscience void of offence towards God and man," yet if your Lordship requires it, we would give security for our behavior; but to give bond and security to preach no more in your Excellency's government, if invited and desired by any people, we neither can nor dare do.

L. C. Then you must go to gaol.

F. M. We are neither ashamed nor afraid of what we have done; and we have complied, and are ready still to comply, with the act of Parliament, which, we hope, will protect us at last. And it will be unaccountable to England, to hear that Jews, who openly blaspheme the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and disown the whole Christian religion—the Quakers, who disown the fundamental doctrines of the Church of England and both the sacraments—the Lutherans, and all others, are tolerated in your Lordship's government, and only we, who have complied and are still ready to comply with the Act of Toleration, and are nearest to and likest to the Church of England of any Dissenters, should be hindered, and that only in the government of New York and the Jerseys. This will appear strange indeed.

L. C. You must blame the Queen for that.

F. M. We do not, neither have we any reason to blame her Majesty, for she molests none, neither countenances nor encourages any who do; and has given frequent assurances, *and of late*, in her gracious speech to her Parliament, *that she would inviolably maintain the Toleration.*

While Lord Carnbury was writing precepts for discharging us from the custody of Cardale, high sheriff of Queen's county in Long Island, and another for our commitment in New York, Mr. John Hampton demanded a license of Lord Carnbury, but he absolutely denied it. And before finishing of said mittimus for their commitment, Mr. Francis Makemie moved that it was highly necessary that the law should be produced before their commitment, to determine the point whether it is local and limited or not. And it was not to be doubted but Mr. Attorney was soon able to produce the law. And he further offered to pay Mr. Attorney for a copy of that paragraph in which the limiting clause is, if any. But every thing relating hereunto was declined and disregarded.

L. C. You, sir, know law?

F. M. I do not, my Lord, pretend to know law; but I pretend to know this particular law, having had sundry disputes thereon. The mittimus being finished, they were committed to the custody of Ebenezer Wilson, high sheriff of York city and county, and carried to his dwelling-house as the place of their confinement; and, after sundry demands, they had upon the 25th day the following copy of their precept for their commitment, viz:

You are hereby required and commanded to take into your custody the bodies of Francis Makemie and John Hampton, and them safely keep, till further orders; and for so doing this shall be your warrant.

Given under my hand and seal this 23d day of January, 1706–7.

CARNBURY. [SEAL.]

To Ebenezer Wilson, Esq., High Sheriff of New York.

A true copy: EBENEZER WILSON.

There are sundry things observable in this warrant of commitment which are not usual in warrants granted in England. 1. That it is granted and signed by the supreme authority, and not by any sworn officers appointed and authorized by law for commitment of offenders. And the supreme authority of England have not put any such power into practice, without a special act of Parliament empowering them so to do; and that only upon necessity, and emergent occasions. 2d. Here is no mention of the Queen's name or authority, which must be acknowledged as a novelty not easily understood. 3d. There is not the least shadow of a crime, or suspicion of a crime alleged, which is but a slender cause of commitment. 4th. This mittimus is erroneous in conclusion; which should be, *until they are delivered by due course of law*, and not *until further orders*, which is condemned by law and lawyers as insufficient.

And finding themselves imprisoned, and put under an unlimited confinement, they addressed Lord Carnbury by the following humble petition, presented to his Lordship by the hands of Ebenezer Wilson, High Sheriff:

To his Excellency, Edward Viscount Carnbury, Captain General and Governor-in-Chief of the Province of New York and New Jersey, and all the tracts of land depending thereon in America, and Admiral of the same—the humble petition of Francis Makemie and John Hampton most humbly sheweth:

That whereas your Excellency has been pleased to commit us to prison by a precept wherein there is no crime alleged, we, your Lordship's most

humble petitioners and prisoners, most humbly pray we may be permitted to know our crime. And your Excellency's most humble petitioners and prisoners further pray, as we are strangers on our journey to New England, above four hundred miles from our habitations, we may be allowed a speedy trial according to law, which we humbly conceive to be the undoubted right and privilege of every English subject. And your Excellency's most humble petitioners and afflicted prisoners shall, as in duty bound, always pray.

FRANCIS MAKEMIE,
JOHN HAMPTON.

To which petition, after sundry days, they received the following verbal answer by the Sheriff, who presented the former petition. 1. Lord Carnbury did admire they should petition to know their crime, he having so often told them. 2d. If they take the right way they may have a trial. And though they signified their desire both to the Sheriff and Mr. Attorney to know what that right way was, yet could learn nothing, therefore resolved to arm themselves with patience until they could obtain a writ of *habeas corpus* from the Honorable Roger Mompesson, Esq., Chief Justice, who lived in another government, and who could sign no such writ until he came into the government of New York, and thereby to bring ourselves to a trial, or be discharged according to due course of law. In the meantime, the Quarter Sessions of the city and county of New York coming in course, and being still absolute strangers to the constitution of New York, and being ready to manifest their willingness to comply with the Act of Toleration in all things, they addressed Lord Carnbury by the following petition:

The humble petition of Francis Makemie and John Hampton most humbly sheweth:

That whereas your Lordship is pleased not to allow our certificates from courts of record in Virginia and Maryland to reach to your Excellency's government, therefore we, being your Lordship's prisoners, most humbly pray we may be admitted, in custody of the Sheriff, to apply ourselves to the Quarter Sessions, that we may there offer ourselves to qualification as the law directs, which we are again ready to do, we being resolved to reside in your Lordship's government. And we, your Excellency's most humble petitioners and afflicted prisoners, as in duty bound, shall always pray.

This being rejected, with severe threatenings against the messengers for presenting a petition without signing, they resolved to trouble his Excellency with no more petitions. And being called "the petition of Francis Makemie and John Hampton," and writ by the hand of one of them, and not being acquainted with the practice of signing all petitions, it was manifest it came from them and no other persons.

Next we addressed ourselves to the Quarter Sessions, then sitting, the 5th day of February, by the following petition to the same purpose:

To the worshipful Justices of the Peace, now sitting in the Quarter Sessions for the city and county of New York, the humble petition of Francis Makemie and John Hampton humbly sheweth:

That whereas your petitioners are Protestant Ministers dissenting from the Church of England, who have certificates from courts of record of Virginia and Maryland, certifying we have taken the oaths and performed all such qualifications as are required in an Act of Toleration made the first year of King William and Queen Mary, for liberty of their Majesties' protestant and dissenting subjects; which certificates his Excellency Lord Carnbury is not pleased to allow to extend to his government: We therefore, your Worships' humble petitioners, pray we may be admitted to appear in the custody of the Sheriff at the bar of your court, to qualify ourselves again according to the particular directions of said Act of Toleration, which in obedience to the law we are always ready to do. And your Worships' humble petitioners, as in duty bound, shall always pray.

FRANCIS MAKEMIE,
JOHN HAMPTON.

This petition being presented, was viewed and handed about, but never allowed a reading in open court; and Mr. Attorney laying hold thereon was putting it in his pocket, asserting it to be a libel against Lord Carnbury, and told the Justices it was none of their business to administer the qualifications, or to this effect.

At the same time a certificate in writing was presented by two inhabitants for certifying the dwelling-house of William Jackson, where Mr. Makemie had preached, desiring the same to be put on record. And though the court had these things under consideration for two days, and put the presenters of these papers to the trouble of a second appearance, and to bring them law for the court's direction, all was rejected; though they had not long before recorded a Quaker meeting-house, certified by two men to the same court, upon the same act of Parliament. But, for the information of all, whatever offers are made to any proper court for qualifications, where the Act of Toleration takes place, is a legal qualification in the eye of the law, though the courts reject, and take no notice thereof.*

At length, some days before the March term, soon after the arrival of the Chief Justice Roger Mompesson, Esq., the prisoners, by their lawyer Mr. Reigniere, presented to the Chief Justice the following petition, at his chamber:

* See the foregoing Act of Toleration, upon that part bearing upon this point.

To the Hon. Roger Mompesson, Esq., Chief Justice of this her Majesty's province of New York, may it please your honor:

We, the subscribers, being prisoners detained in the custody of the Sheriff of New York, by virtue of a warrant, whereof a true copy is hereunto annexed, do most humbly request your honor to grant and award us her Majesty's writ of habeas corpus, to be directed to the said sheriff, that we may be thereby brought before your honor, or some other Judge, in order to our enlargement according to law.

We, your honor's most humble servants, &c.

FRANCIS MAKEMIE,
JOHN HAMPTON.

After a due consideration of the statutes in this case provided, the following writ of habeas corpus was granted, and the prisoners were not without hopes to be discharged without bail, there being no crime nor suspicion of crime specified in our warrant of commitment:

Anne, by the Grace of God, Queen of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c., to the Sheriff of our city of New York, greeting:

We command you that the bodies of Francis Makemie and John Hampton, in our prison under your custody detained, (as it is said,) under safe and sure conduct, together with the day and cause of their caption and detention, by whatsoever names the same Francis and John may be repeated in the same, you have before our trusty and well-beloved Roger Mompesson, Esq., our Chief Justice of our Supreme Court of Judicature of our province of New York, at his chamber, situated in Queen street in the city of New York, immediately after receiving this writ; to do and receive all and singular these things which our said Chief Justice of him shall then and there consider in this behalf, and have you then and there this writ.

Witness Roger Mompesson, Esq., our Chief Justice, at New York, this 8th day of March, in the sixth year of our reign.

GEORGE CLARKE.

Octavo die Martij infra scrept. Allo. per me.

ROGER MOMPESSON.

The execution of this writ appears in the schedule hereunto annexed.

EBENEZER WILSON, *Sheriff.*

A true copy: GEORGE CLARKE.

This writ, being put into the Sheriff's hands on Saturday, was not executed till Monday afternoon, at which time the Sheriff told them he had another mittimus put into his hands, wherein a supposed crime was specified, and only to be detained until discharged by due course of law; and so

were obliged to provide securities. But as our confinement was by the former mittimus, by this new mittimus our imprisonment was implicitly adjudged and owned to be *false imprisonment* for six weeks and four days. And the Sheriff, in the presence of Doctor John Johnstone, Mr. Reigniere, and Mr. William Jackson, refused to execute the aforesaid writ until they had paid him twelve pieces of eight for their commitment, and as much more for the return of the writ of habeas corpus, denying also receipts for the money when paid.

They were conducted the immediate day before the Supreme Court, and upon their new mittimus, contained in the following return, were obliged to enter into recognizance with two securities, Doctor John Johnstone and William Jackson, for their appearance next day at the Supreme Court, and bound not to depart without the court's leave. The return is as follows, viz:

I, Ebenezer Wilson, Esq., sheriff of the city and county aforesaid, to Roger Mompesson, Esq., Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Judicature in the province of New York, at the time and place in the writ to this schedule annexed specified, do humbly certify, that before the coming of that writ to me directed, the within Francis Makemie and John Hampton were committed unto the jail and prison of our Lady the Queen of the city of New York, under my custody, by virtue of a certain warrant under the hand and seal of Edward Viscount Carnbury, Captain General and Governor-in-Chief of the province of New York, bearing date the 23d day of January last past, the tenor of whtch warrant followeth in these words, viz:

You are hereby required and commanded to take into your custody the bodies of Francis Makemie and John Hampton, and them safely keep till further orders, and for so doing this shall be your sufficient warrant. Given under my hand and seal this 23d day of January, 1806-7. Carnbury. To Ebenezer Wilson, Esq., sheriff of city and county of New York.

And I do further certify, that before the coming of the said writ to me directed, that the said Francis Makemie and John Hampton were committed afterwards by another warrant, under the hand and seal of his said Excellency Edward Viscount Carnbury, Governor aforesaid, bearing date 8th day of March instant, unto the jail and prison aforesaid, under my custody; the tenor of which warrant also followeth in these words:

New York, *sc:* You are hereby required and commanded to take into your custody the bodies of Francis Makemie and John Hampton, pretended Dissenting Ministers, for preaching in this province without qualifying themselves according to an act of Parliament made at Westminster in the first year of the reign of our late sovereign Lord and Lady, King William and Queen Mary, and also without my license first obtained, and them safely to keep till they shall be discharged by due course of law; and for

so doing this shall be your sufficient warrant. Given under my hand and seal this 8th day of March, A. D. 1706. Carnbury. To Ebenezer Wilson, Esq., high sheriff of the city and county of New York.

And this is the cause of the taking and detaining the bodies of the aforesaid Francis Makemie and John Hampton; yet the bodies of them, said Francis Makemie and John Hampton, before the said Roger Mompesson, Esq., Chief Justice aforesaid, at the time and place in the writ aforesaid specified, I have ready, as it is in the said writ commanded me.

A true copy: GEORGE CLARKE.

And here it is further observable, that the second warrant is still granted and signed by the supreme authority,* and without mentioning the Queen's name or authority; and the supposed crime specified is double, as, 1st. Preaching in New York government without complying with the qualifications of the act of Parliament made in the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary; whereas Lord Carnbury had read in January their certificates, both from Virginia and Maryland, certifying their qualification according to said act of Parliament. 2d. Preaching without license being first obtained of Lord Carnbury; whereby it is plain that complying with the law is not esteemed sufficient without a license. And from what goes before, it is undeniable that they were qualified, and had complied with the law even in New York, by tendering themselves (which was all they could do, and which was all the law required of them) not only to his Excellency, but also to the Quarter Sessions for qualification. And such as had license are not yet qualified according to said act of Parliament; for taking the oaths only before Lord Carnbury, and taking them before a court, are not the same thing.

Having, therefore, related all these antecedents to the trial, we are now arrived at the trial or prosecution at the Supreme Court, in March term.

PROVINCE OF NEW YORK—SUPREME COURT,
March, the 1st Tuesday, 1806-7.

Present—Roger Mompesson, Esq., Chief Justice, Robert Millward, and Thomas Wenham, Esq., Justices.

The Court being called formally, and the docket called over, Francis Makemie and John Hampton made their appearance, and answered to their names according to the tenor of their recognizance.

At the Attorney General's motion, it was ordered that the defendants be continued on their recognizance, and that they attend the last day of the term. The panel of the Grand Jury was as follows, viz:

* That is, the supreme authority of Lord Carnbury alone.

William Merritt, William Anderson, Robert Lurting, Lawrence Reed, Dave Cromline, Richard Sacket, Beverly Lathum, Johannis Hoogland, Benjamin Winroop, Abraham Jeanneau, Elias Boudmot, Nathaniel Mastin, Francis Vincent, Lewis Carree, Lancaster Symes, Adrian Hoogland, Charles Wooley, Peter Ryckman, Paul Drolet, William Provoost, Johannis Burger.

A true copy: GEORGE CLARKE.

Mr. Reigniere, attorney for defendant, moved that the writ of habeas corpus, with all proceedings thereon at the Chief Justice's chamber, might be entered upon record. Mr. Attorney for the Queen replied, it was not matter of record; being obtained not in open court, but at the Chief Justice's chamber, and returned to the same place, therefore was not matter of record; so it was put off for that time.

WEDNESDAY—*Second day of the Term.*

SUPREME COURT, *New York*, sc.

Memorandum. That, at the Supreme Court of this province, held at the city of New York the second Tuesday of March, in the sixth year of her Majesty's reign, Roger Mompesson, Esq., Chief Justice of the province, delivered into said court a certain record, the tenor whereof followeth in these words, viz:

NEW YORK, *sc.* *To the Supreme Court of the province of New York:*

I, Roger Mompesson, Chief Justice of the said court, do hereby certify that upon the 8th day of March instant, upon a petition signed by Francis Makemie and John Hampton, then delivered to me, I granted and allowed the writ of habeas corpus, hereunto annexed; which being returned unto me, at my chamber in the said city of New York, by Ebenezer Wilson, sheriff, &c., the 10th day of this instant month of March, with the bodies of the said Francis Makemie and John Hampton, together with the causes of their commitment, hereunto annexed; whereupon I did, at the day and place last mentioned, discharge the said Francis Makemie and John Hampton from their several imprisonments, taking the several recognizances hereunto annexed.

ROGER MOMPESSON.

NEW YORK, *sc.*

Memorandum. On the 10th day of March, in the sixth year of Queen Anne's reign, came before me, Roger Mompesson, Chief Justice, &c., Francis Makemie, of &c., John Johnstone, of &c., gentlemen, and William Jackson, &c., cordwainer, &c., and acknowledged themselves severally to be indebted to the Lady Queen, as follows, viz: The said Francis Makemie in the sum of forty pounds current money, and the said Johnstone

and Jackson in twenty pounds like money each, to be levied upon their goods, chattels, &c. if failure be made in the condition endorsed.

ROGER MOMPESSON.

The condition of the within recognizance is such, that if the said Francis Makemie do personally appear before her Majesty's Justices of the Supreme Court on the morrow of this day, being Tuesday the 11th of March, there to answer all such matters and things as shall be objected against him, and shall not depart without leave of the said court, then the said recognizance to be void. Vera copia.

GEORGE CLARKE.

The Grand Jury being called and sworn the first day of the term, and though there was little beside this matter given them in charge, yet, after sundry debates, several meetings, and adjournments, found the following presentment against Francis Makemie. The Queen's Attorney, for reasons best known to himself, gave nothing in charge to the Grand Jury against John Hampton, who was now dropped out of the prosecution, though both equally guilty of the same crime, of preaching a sermon in the government of New York, and suffered equally by imprisonment, from which both were relieved by the former writ of habeas corpus.

And to such as knew the Grand Jury when called and sworn, they plainly appeared to be chosen on purpose to find a presentment; for some of them had never been upon a Grand Jury, others not for sundry years, and sundry of them justices of the peace, who, at the Quarter Sessions, had so far prejudged them and their cause, as to refuse to allow their petition a public reading, or to take the least notice of the certification of a house offered to record at the same time by two of the inhabitants of York, and one of them threatened as to his trade and business for appearing to countenance such a design. Yet with hard struggling twelve were influenced, and the two last who made up this number were persons of Dissenting congregations from the Church of England, and their teachers (or Ministers) as liable to be prosecuted as Mr. Makemie, and liable to the same or like presentment. Another, one Daniel Cromline, a French refugee, dragooned out of France for the same Protestant religion and persuasion, and Adrian Hoogland, of the Dutch congregation, whose Minister has yet no license, being a new made lieutenant of a troop. After four of Mr. Makemie's hearers, Captain John Theobalds, Mr. John Vanhorne, Mr. Anthony Young, and Harris, coachman to Lord Carnbury, being subpœnaed, gave evidence upon oath that they heard no unsound doctrine, nor any thing against the government; and one of the evidences delivered to the jury the act of Assembly of New York for liberty of conscience to all except Papists, and showed to them Mr. Makemie's certificate from a court of record in

Virginia of his compliance with the qualifications of the Act of Toleration; they, notwithstanding, at length consented to find the indictment; whose votes were on Friday in the afternoon taken in a new and an unusual manner, as they came in one by one from dinner.

FRIDAY—*The First Term.*

The Grand Jury find the following bill, which is ordered to be filed:

CITY OF NEW YORK, *sc.*

The Jurors of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, upon their oath do present, that Francis Makemie, late of the province of Virginia, gentleman, pretending himself to be a Protestant Dissenting Minister and Preacher, and contemning and endeavoring to subvert the supremacy, jurisdiction, and authority of our now Lady and Queen in ecclesiastical affairs, the 22d day of January and fifth year of the Queen's reign, to wit, at the southward of the city of New York, did privately and unlawfully take upon him to preach and teach, and did preach and teach divers of her Majesty's liege subjects within the said city, to wit, at the dwelling-house of one William Jackson, situate in the ward aforesaid, privately and unlawfully then and there met and assembled together, to above the number of five persons at one time, under the pretence of Divine worship, without any leave or license by him the said Francis first had and obtained according to law for the same, in great derogation of the Royal authority and prerogative of our Lady the Queen, and to the evil example of all others in like case offending against the peace of our Lady, her crown, and dignity. And the Jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do further present, that the said Francis Makemie afterward, to wit, the 22d day of January in the year aforesaid, at the city and ward aforesaid, and at the aforesaid dwelling-house of the said William Jackson, did privately and unlawfully assemble and gather together divers of her Majesty's subjects unknown, did then and there voluntarily and unlawfully use other rites, ceremonies, form, and manner of Divine worship than what are contained in a certain book of common prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and of other rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, against the form of the statute in that case made and provided, and against the peace of our said Lady the Queen, her crown, and dignity. And the Jurors aforesaid do further present, that the said Francis Makemie afterwards, to wit, the 22d day of January, in the fifth year aforesaid, being then, and now is, a person not qualified by law to preach, teach, and officiate in any congregation or assembly for religious worship at the city aforesaid, to wit, at the southward of the city, at the aforesaid dwelling-house of the said William Jackson, situate in the

said ward, did take upon him to preach, teach, and officiate, and then and there did preach, teach, and officiate in a congregation, assembly, conventicle, and meeting, not permitted or allowed by law, under color or excuse of religion, in other manner than according to the liturgy and practice of the Church of England, &c. At which conventicle, meeting, and assembly, were five persons or more assembled together, against the form of the statute in that case made and provided, against the peace of our Lady the Queen, her crown, and dignity, &c.

A true copy: GEORGE CLARKE, *Secretary.*

Here is a presentment for preaching a sermon at York highly aggravated into a cumulative crime, and thereby the Grand Jury led into no small mistake in point of time; for it is said to be preached on the 22d day of January, whereas it was preached on the 20th of January. For these two Ministers were Lord Carnbury's prisoners, apprehended on Long Island on the 22d day instant, by a warrant dated the 21st day. Which error was cause enough in point of law for overthrowing the whole presentment, which was so delayed and put off to the last day of the court that the trial could not be obtained at that court; therefore Mr. Reigniere, the defendant's counsel, made a motion that the defendant's appearance be put upon record; and it was ordered that the defendant be continued on his recognizance till the next term. Mr. Makemie, being the only person prosecuted, returns to Virginia, and returned again before June term, the 3d of said month.

PROVINCE OF NEW YORK,

Tuesday, 3d day of June, 1707.

Present—Roger Mompesson, Esq., Chief Justice, Robert Millward, and Thomas Wenham, Esquires, Justices.

The first day of the term. The defendant's appearance is entered, and he is ordered to be continued on his recognizance. The defendant ordered to plead to-morrow.

Wednesday, June 4th, 1707.

The defendant pleaded not guilty of any crime by preaching a sermon at York.

The Attorney General for the Queen moves to know if they would allow a copy of the Queen's instructions to the Governor, signed by his Excellency, to be brought into court in evidence at the trial, seeing his Excellency, who had the original, was then in the Jerseys. The defendant replied they could admit of no copies, seeing there was time enough to produce the original; or Mr. Attorney might have compared the copy with the original, and might have been able to give his affidavit to the truth of the said copy. But perceiving if that copy was not allowed, the

Queen's Attorney would put off the trial till another term, therefore Mr. Attorney General for the Queen, and Mr. William Nicholl for the defendant, agrees that the copy of such instructions from her Majesty to the Governor as shall be produced by the Attorney General and signed by the Governor, shall be admitted on trial, to be the same in evidence as if the original instructions were produced. Francis Makemie, defendant, moved, that if allowed in evidence, he might have a copy of the said instructions; and further declared he could not but wonder of what service these instructions, which were no law, could do to Mr. Attorney, seeing the presentment run upon statutes and act of Parliament, and they expected to have a trial before a court who were judges of law and not of private instructions.

Friday, June 6th, 1707.

The Petit Jury was called, whose names follow according to the panel, and twelve of them sworn to try the matter in issue; and the defendant told the Court he was under great disadvantage, being a stranger, and knew neither names nor faces; and though he knew he had not liberty in that cause of peremptory objections against any without showing sufficient ground of exception: but he was informed of one Mr. Elias Neau, who had in discourse with Mr. Anthony Young prejudged the cause, by condemning him for preaching a sermon, and justified Lord Carnbury's proceedings against him, which being proved by the testimony of said Young, was approved of by the Court as a good objection in law. The defendant further added, he was amazed to find one who was so lately dragooned out of France for his religion, and delivered out of the galley, so soon prove a persecutor of the same religion for preaching a sermon in this city.

The Jurors being sworn, their names here follow: John Shepherd, foreman, Thomas Ives, Joseph Wright, Thomas Wooden, Joseph Robinson, Bartholomew Larouex, Andrew Lauron, Humphrey Perkins, William Horswell, Thomas Carrell, Thomas Bayuex, and Charles Cromline.

Mr. Attorney produced a copy of the Queen's instructions signed by Lord Carnbury, and which was allowed by both parties in evidence as if the original were present, though a copy had been denied again and again to the defendant; yet, by a copy of instructions from King William to a former Governor, the same instructions were found in the same words. But as they were in two paragraphs in the produced copy, so they were in the former copy, but found at a great distance from one another. These two paragraphs were therefore supposed to be agreeable to the original, and to be two distinct, and vastly different instructions; one of them relating to Dissenters, and the other relating to the Ministers of the Church of England, as may plainly appear from the instructions themselves, which are the following words, viz:

"*And you are to permit a liberty of conscience to all persons, except Papists, so they be content with a quiet and peaceable enjoyment of it, not giving offence or scandal to the Government.*"

"*You are not to permit any Minister coming from England to preach in your Government, without a certificate from the Right Reverend the Bishop of London; nor any other Minister coming from any other part or place, without first obtaining leave from our Governor.*"

Mr. Attorney orders four of Mr. Makemie's hearers to be called—Captain John Theobalds, Mr. John Vanhorne, Mr. William Jackson, and Mr. Anthony Young—who answered to their names.

The defendant, perceiving they were summoned and called to give their evidence to the matter of fact, told the Court that the swearing of these four gentlemen as evidences would but give a needless trouble, and take up the time of the court, and he would own the matter of fact as to his preaching, and more than these gentlemen could declare upon oath; for he had done nothing therein that he was ashamed or afraid of, but would answer and own it, not only before this bar, but before the tribunal of God's final judgment. And so Mr. Attorney proposed, and Mr. Makemie answered the following questions, or to the same purpose:

Mr. Attorney. You own that you preached a sermon, and baptized a child at Mr. William Jackson's?

Francis Makemie. I did.

Mr. A. How many hearers had you?

F. M. I have other work to do, Mr. Attorney, than number my auditory when I am about to preach to them.

Mr. A. Were there above five hearing you?

F. M. Yes, and five to that.

Mr. A. Did you use the rites and ceremonies enjoined by, and prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer by the Church of England?

F. M. No; I never did, nor ever will, till I am better satisfied in my conscience.

Mr. A. Did you ask leave, or acquaint my Lord Carnbury with your preaching at York, when you dined with him at the Fort?

F. M. I did not know of my preaching at York when I dined with his Excellency; no, not for some days after. For when we came to York we had not the least intention or design of preaching there, but stopped at York purely to pay our respects to the Governor, which we did; but being afterwards called and invited to preach, as I was a Minister of the Gospel I durst not deny preaching, and I hope I never shall when it is wanting and desired.

Mr. A. Did you acquaint my Lord Carnbury with the place of your preaching?

F. M. As soon as I determined to preach, leave was asked, though not by me; for it was the people's business, and not mine, to provide a place for me to preach in. And I would have been admitted to preach in the Dutch church, but they were afraid of offending Lord Carnbury. And Anthony Young went to the Governor to have his leave or permission for my preaching in the Dutch church, though all this was done without so much as my knowledge. But my Lord opposing and denying it, I was under the necessity of preaching where I did, in a private house, though in a public manner, and with open doors.

Mr. Attorney, in pleading, first read over the indictment which the Grand Jury had found, and endeavored to prove the several parts thereof, by giving a large and full account of sundry statutes of King Henry VIII, asserting and establishing the supremacy of the King over all ecclesiastical persons and affairs in his dominion of England. And from thence asserted the Queen's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, and over ecclesiastical persons; which supremacy was by a delegation lodged in his Excellency our Governor, and which he is sworn to exercise; and this is signified to him by her Majesty's instructions, which were read in court. Then he produced, and read as much as was necessary of those statutes of Queen Elizabeth and King Charles II, for uniformity of worship, according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, and the penal laws against conventicles. He enlarged in his pleadings on these points, and, turning to the gentlemen of the Jury, he said, the matter of fact is plainly confessed by the defendant, and I have proved it to be repugnant to the Queen's instructions and sundry acts of Parliament; therefore, he did not doubt but that the Jury would find for the Queen against the defendant.

Mr. James Reigniere, attorney for the defendant, pleaded against the attorney for the Queen, in the following manner:

The indictment charges three distinct and separate facts as crimes against the defendant. First. That he, a pretended Protestant Minister, endeavoring to subvert the Queen's supremacy, jurisdiction, and authority in ecclesiastical affairs, did, privately and unlawfully, preach and teach at William Jackson's house, divers subjects, privately and unlawfully, to above five in number, without license had according to law, in derogation to the Royal authority and prerogative, to the evil example, &c. Cont. Par.

Secondly. That he did assemble divers unknown, and voluntarily and unlawfully use any other rites and forms of worship than are in the Common Prayer Book and the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England. Cont. Form. Stat.

Thirdly. That being not qualified by law to preach and teach in a congregation or meeting not allowed by law, in other manner than according

to the practice of the Church of England, at which meeting were five persons or more assembled. Cont. Form. Stat.

As to the indictment, ut supra, that the defendant did not preach privately nor the persons assembled privately, that is with doors locked, barred or bolted. Nay, it appears by the evidence, and agreed to the contrary by Mr. Attorney General. For people to meet unlawfully must appear by the violation of some known law or statute in force here, by which such meeting or preaching is forbidden, that is to say, the preaching to above five.

I take this colony as a dominion of England, to be governed by, and be subject to these three sorts of laws: 1st. The common law of England; 2d. The express statutes mentioning the plantations, and such others as are for public good, (as the Chief Justice was pleased to say in this Court in the case depending between Smith and Davis;) 3d. By the laws of this colony, and those are to be, as near as may be, agreeable to the laws and statutes of England; and the Judges of this Court (I dare say) will examine and determine no fact, but according to the mode and rule of some of those laws.

That preaching without license and assembling above five is a crime at common law, I never read; and it is not alleged to be against any statute; it must, then, be an offence against some law of this province, which as yet I never saw, and desire I may now see it; and if such does not appear to exist, then undoubtedly *where there is no law there can be no transgression.*

As to what is offered by Mr. Attorney, that the Queen, as supreme head of the church of England, hath power to make ordinances and punish for breach thereof, and that this power is delegated to the Governor, who is bound by oath to execute them—supposing and admitting all this, yet nothing like an ordinance appears. For the instructions produced by Mr. Attorney cannot have the force of a law or ordinance, especially against persons to whom they were never communicated, whatever they may be to those to whom they were given, who alone hath the custody of them and conceal them from public view.

As to the two articles in the indictment, Cont. Form. Stat. Now there are divers statutes made in England, which enjoin a due observance of the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, as, 1st Elizabeth, chapter 2d; 2d Elizabeth, chapter 1st, twenty pounds a month for not going to church; 29th Elizabeth, chapter 6th, the same; 3d James, chapters 4 and 5. But all these were pointed and levelled at Romish recusants only, though sometimes misconstrued to extend to others. Also, 35th Elizabeth, chapter 1st, forbidding all meeting of conventicles under penalty of abjuration and public submission; 16th Car., chapter 2d, now expired,

and the 22d Car., 2d. But all these are restricted to England, Wales, and Berwick on Tweed. But if they had not been so restricted, as they are positive and additional, they shall be confined strictly to place and words, then the practice in all the colonies and plantations, and the laws made in some of them, for the establishment of the Church of England. But there is no such establishment here; on the contrary, a law formerly made in this province, and in print, allowing liberty of conscience, which is in the following words. This is the last clause of an act of Assembly made in the government of New York, declaring the rights and privileges of the subject, viz:

"That no person or persons, who profess faith in God by Jesus Christ his only Son, shall at any time be any way molested, punished, disturbed, disquieted, or called into question for any difference in opinion or matter of religious concernment, who do not under that pretence disturb the civil peace of the province, &c. And that all and every such person and persons may, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, freely have and fully enjoy his or their opinion, persuasion, and judgment, in matters of conscience and religion, throughout all this province; and freely meet at convenient places within this province, and there worship according to their respective persuasions without being hindered or molested, they behaving themselves peaceably, quietly, modestly, and religiously, and not using their liberty to licentiousnesss nor to the civil injury or outward disturbance of others. Always provided, that nothing herein mentioned or contained shall extend to, or give liberty to any person of the Romish religion to exercise their manner of worship, contrary to the laws and statutes of their Majesties' kingdom of England."

And though Mr. Attorney endeavored to invalidate this by denying this law to be in force, yet could he not prove this law abolished. And by one part of the instructions which Mr. Attorney produced, in totidem verbis, is the same that has been given to former governors of this province, liberty of conscience is directed to be allowed.

And as to the third article in the indictment, that seems to refer to the 1st of William and Mary, of Toleration; but as we say the penal statutes did not extend hither, so is there no occasion of toleration. The laws and statutes of England, by their own force, extend equally to all plantations of England alike, and if these penal laws did extend to the plantations, then the Crown of England would never tolerate the governments of Boston, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and others, who, in their church discipline, are so far from conforming to the Church of England that they have set up and established another sort of church discipline universally among them. But, notwithstanding this, they are allowed the liberty they always used in their church without molestation, and were so allowed in the very

time when these penal laws were in force in England; but now, since by the late Act of Toleration, it was thought by the wise and experienced legislators of England to be for the public good to repeal those laws even there, for which place alone they were made, and to allow liberty of conscience, I hope it will never be thought that these penal statutes, so repealed, are or can be for the public good here, and as such extended hither. Wherefore, forasmuch as neither by the common law of England nor by any law of the province produced, or even pretended by Mr. Attorney, such preaching or meeting doth not appear unlawful, but on the contrary an express law of the province doth allow it, as hath been shewn, and that the penal laws and statutes of England against Dissenters can by no reasonable construction be extended hither, I humbly conceive, therefore, that my client is not guilty of any offence against law, and I hope and expect the Jury will acquit him accordingly.

Mr. William Nicholl, attorney for the defendant, pleaded in the next place as followeth: Mr. Attorney has been entertaining us with some history from the reign of King Henry VIII, and it is fit we should entertain him with some history also, more ancient and from better authors, and that is from the Acts of the Apostles. For we do find that teaching or preaching or speaking, in itself or by the common law, was never found a crime; for the Apostle Paul preached a very new doctrine to the Athenians, which was an ancient commonwealth, and was not condemned nor imprisoned for it, but they were curious to hear again, Acts 17th, concerning the new doctrine of the resurrection. But we find that when the same Apostle began to insist on any doctrine which tended to infringe the gain of the silversmiths who, Acts 18th, made shrines for Diana the goddess of the Ephesians, they were enraged and made an uproar against him, rushing into the theatre; but it was no crime either in Corinth or Athens, where no man was hurt by the doctrine itself, neither was obstructed by nor any offence taken by the civil government. And it is plain it was no offence to common law, but was made so by the old statute of 5th Richard 2d, chapter 5th; 2d Henry 4th, chapter 15th; 2d Henry 5th; but all these statutes being repealed by 1st Edward 6th, chapter 4th, and the acts of Elizabeth, it was still no transgression, but remains as it was, no crime at common law. And the four statutes against conventicles, in chapter 2d, are all local, and in express words limited to England, Wales, and Berwick on Tweed, and so have no relation to nor reach to any of the plantations.

And this is further manifest from the constitutions of the plantations being, as it were, settled by national consent, for those whose thoughts in religious affairs could not square with the public establishment in church government, discipline, and ceremonies; as, New England for Independents

and Presbyterians; Rhode Island and New Jersey, and we may add New York, for the several sorts of the Dissenters in general; Pennsylvania for Quakers, and Maryland for Papists in particular. And this being the first that was prosecuted in this nature in the plantations, is made the more remarkable, so long after the news of that harsh statute of Charles 2d had been cut up by the statute of 1st William and Mary.

And it is already evidently proved that the acts of the Assembly of New York allow liberty of conscience, with freedom of public worship to all but Papists.

What was offered on the other side by Mr. Attorney as being against the Queen's prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs, was foreign and not all to the purpose; for all the statutes relating to that matter being to assert the Queen's empire and jurisdiction over ecclesiastical persons, as well as laymen, in opposition to the claims and usurpation of the See of Rome, to exempt the clergy or churchmen from the civil and secular power.

And as to the Queen's instructions, they are not, neither can have the force of law; besides that these two instructions produced in court are no way against us, but rather for us.

Mr. David Jamison, attorney for the defendant, appeared next to plead. His defence was in the following manner:

Mr. Riegniere and Mr Nicholl, attorneys on the same side, having offered so many and large arguments, have left but little room for new matter to be offered, without enumerating what was offered upon the three heads of the indictment. As to the first, which was preaching and teaching without license, against the Queen's supremacy and prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs: We did not come here to approve or call in question the Queen's prerogative or supremacy, but were willing to pay all due respect and deference thereto. But we cannot see that these instructions from the Queen to my Lord Carnbury, of which Mr. Attorney has produced a copy, and which he alleges to be the law we have broken by preaching contrary to the Queen's instructions, which are not a law to any body else but to his lordship, who is directed by them, and is accountable to the Queen if he does not observe them. Her instructions are private directions to himself, and can be no law to others. Promulgation is that which gives the finishing stroke to a law. Nor do I see how his Lordship should become guilty of a breach of oath, as Mr. Attorney is pleased to offer, by not ordering the prosecution of this gentleman for preaching without his license, although he be sworn to obey and observe his instructions; because the very instructions produced give liberty of conscience to Protestant Dissenters, and are in two distinct paragraphs; the first of which seems to me wholly to agree with our act of Assembly of this province,

and Jackson in twenty pounds like money each, to be levied upon their goods, chattels, &c. if failure be made in the condition endorsed.

ROGER MOMPESSON.

The condition of the within recognizance is such, that if the said Francis Makemie do personally appear before her Majesty's Justices of the Supreme Court on the morrow of this day, being Tuesday the 11th of March, there to answer all such matters and things as shall be objected against him, and shall not depart without leave of the said court, then the said recognizance to be void. Vera copia.

GEORGE CLARKE.

The Grand Jury being called and sworn the first day of the term, and though there was little beside this matter given them in charge, yet, after sundry debates, several meetings, and adjournments, found the following presentment against Francis Makemie. The Queen's Attorney, for reasons best known to himself, gave nothing in charge to the Grand Jury against John Hampton, who was now dropped out of the prosecution, though both equally guilty of the same crime, of preaching a sermon in the government of New York, and suffered equally by imprisonment, from which both were relieved by the former writ of habeas corpus.

And to such as knew the Grand Jury when called and sworn, they plainly appeared to be chosen on purpose to find a presentment; for some of them had never been upon a Grand Jury, others not for sundry years, and sundry of them justices of the peace, who, at the Quarter Sessions, had so far prejudged them and their cause, as to refuse to allow their petition a public reading, or to take the least notice of the certification of a house offered to record at the same time by two of the inhabitants of York, and one of them threatened as to his trade and business for appearing to countenance such a design. Yet with hard struggling twelve were influenced, and the two last who made up this number were persons of Dissenting congregations from the Church of England, and their teachers (or Ministers) as liable to be prosecuted as Mr. Makemie, and liable to the same or like presentment. Another, one Daniel Cromline, a French refugee, dragooned out of France for the same Protestant religion and persuasion, and Adrian Hoogland, of the Dutch congregation, whose Minister has yet no license, being a new made lieutenant of a troop. After four of Mr. Makemie's hearers, Captain John Theobalds, Mr. John Vanhorne, Mr. Anthony Young, and Harris, coachman to Lord Carnbury, being subpœnaed, gave evidence upon oath that they heard no unsound doctrine, nor any thing against the government; and one of the evidences delivered to the jury the act of Assembly of New York for liberty of conscience to all except Papists, and showed to them Mr. Makemie's certificate from a court of record in

Virginia of his compliance with the qualifications of the Act of Toleration; they, notwithstanding, at length consented to find the indictment; whose votes were on Friday in the afternoon taken in a new and an unusual manner, as they came in one by one from dinner.

FRIDAY—*The First Term.*

The Grand Jury find the following bill, which is ordered to be filed:

CITY OF NEW YORK, *sc.*

The Jurors of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, upon their oath do present, that Francis Makemie, late of the province of Virginia, gentleman, pretending himself to be a Protestant Dissenting Minister and Preacher, and contemning and endeavoring to subvert the supremacy, jurisdiction, and authority of our now Lady and Queen in ecclesiastical affairs, the 22d day of January and fifth year of the Queen's reign, to wit, at the southward of the city of New York, did privately and unlawfully take upon him to preach and teach, and did preach and teach divers of her Majesty's liege subjects within the said city, to wit, at the dwelling-house of one William Jackson, situate in the ward aforesaid, privately and unlawfully then and there met and assembled together, to above the number of five persons at one time, under the pretence of Divine worship, without any leave or license by him the said Francis first had and obtained according to law for the same, in great derogation of the Royal authority and prerogative of our Lady the Queen, and to the evil example of all others in like case offending against the peace of our Lady, her crown, and dignity. And the Jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do further present, that the said Francis Makemie afterward, to wit, the 22d day of January in the year aforesaid, at the city and ward aforesaid, and at the aforesaid dwelling-house of the said William Jackson, did privately and unlawfully assemble and gather together divers of her Majesty's subjects unknown, did then and there voluntarily and unlawfully use other rites, ceremonies, form, and manner of Divine worship than what are contained in a certain book of common prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and of other rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, against the form of the statute in that case made and provided, and against the peace of our said Lady the Queen, her crown, and dignity. And the Jurors aforesaid do further present, that the said Francis Makemie afterwards, to wit, the 22d day of January, in the fifth year aforesaid, being then, and now is, a person not qualified by law to preach, teach, and officiate in any congregation or assembly for religious worship at the city aforesaid, to wit, at the southward of the city, at the aforesaid dwelling-house of the said William Jackson, situate in the

said ward, did take upon him to preach, teach, and officiate, and then and there did preach, teach, and officiate in a congregation, assembly, conventicle, and meeting, not permitted or allowed by law, under color or excuse of religion, in other manner than according to the liturgy and practice of the Church of England, &c. At which conventicle, meeting, and assembly, were five persons or more assembled together, against the form of the statute in that case made and provided, against the peace of our Lady the Queen, her crown, and dignity, &c.

A true copy: GEORGE CLARKE, *Secretary.*

Here is a presentment for preaching a sermon at York highly aggravated into a cumulative crime, and thereby the Grand Jury led into no small mistake in point of time; for it is said to be preached on the 22d day of January, whereas it was preached on the 20th of January. For these two Ministers were Lord Carnbury's prisoners, apprehended on Long Island on the 22d day instant, by a warrant dated the 21st day. Which error was cause enough in point of law for overthrowing the whole presentment, which was so delayed and put off to the last day of the court that the trial could not be obtained at that court; therefore Mr. Reigniere, the defendant's counsel, made a motion that the defendant's appearance be put upon record; and it was ordered that the defendant be continued on his recognizance till the next term. Mr. Makemie, being the only person prosecuted, returns to Virginia, and returned again before June term, the 3d of said month.

PROVINCE OF NEW YORK,

Tuesday, 3d day of June, 1707.

Present—Roger Mompesson, Esq., Chief Justice, Robert Millward, and Thomas Wenham, Esquires, Justices.

The first day of the term. The defendant's appearance is entered, and he is ordered to be continued on his recognizance. The defendant ordered to plead to-morrow.

Wednesday, June 4th, 1707.

The defendant pleaded not guilty of any crime by preaching a sermon at York.

The Attorney General for the Queen moves to know if they would allow a copy of the Queen's instructions to the Governor, signed by his Excellency, to be brought into court in evidence at the trial, seeing his Excellency, who had the original, was then in the Jerseys. The defendant replied they could admit of no copies, seeing there was time enough to produce the original; or Mr. Attorney might have compared the copy with the original, and might have been able to give his affidavit to the truth of the said copy. But perceiving if that copy was not allowed, the

Queen's Attorney would put off the trial till another term, therefore Mr. Attorney General for the Queen, and Mr. William Nicholl for the defendant, agrees that the copy of such instructions from her Majesty to the Governor as shall be produced by the Attorney General and signed by the Governor, shall be admitted on trial, to be the same in evidence as if the original instructions were produced. Francis Makemie, defendant, moved, that if allowed in evidence, he might have a copy of the said instructions; and further declared he could not but wonder of what service these instructions, which were no law, could do to Mr. Attorney, seeing the presentment run upon statutes and act of Parliament, and they expected to have a trial before a court who were judges of law and not of private instructions.

Friday, June 6th, 1707.

The Petit Jury was called, whose names follow according to the panel, and twelve of them sworn to try the matter in issue; and the defendant told the Court he was under great disadvantage, being a stranger, and knew neither names nor faces; and though he knew he had not liberty in that cause of peremptory objections against any without showing sufficient ground of exception: but he was informed of one Mr. Elias Neau, who had in discourse with Mr. Anthony Young prejudged the cause, by condemning him for preaching a sermon, and justified Lord Carnbury's proceedings against him, which being proved by the testimony of said Young, was approved of by the Court as a good objection in law. The defendant further added, he was amazed to find one who was so lately dragooned out of France for his religion, and delivered out of the galley, so soon prove a persecutor of the same religion for preaching a sermon in this city.

The Jurors being sworn, their names here follow: John Shepherd, foreman, Thomas Ives, Joseph Wright; Thomas Wooden, Joseph Robinson, Bartholomew Larouex, Andrew Lauron, Humphrey Perkins, William Horswell, Thomas Carrell, Thomas Bayuex, and Charles Cromline.

Mr. Attorney produced a copy of the Queen's instructions signed by Lord Carnbury, and which was allowed by both parties in evidence as if the original were present, though a copy had been denied again and again to the defendant; yet, by a copy of instructions from King William to a former Governor, the same instructions were found in the same words. But as they were in two paragraphs in the produced copy, so they were in the former copy, but found at a great distance from one another. These two paragraphs were therefore supposed to be agreeable to the original, and to be two distinct, and vastly different instructions; one of them relating to Dissenters, and the other relating to the Ministers of the Church of England, as may plainly appear from the instructions themselves, which are in the following words, viz:

"*And you are to permit a liberty of conscience to all persons, except Papists, so they be content with a quiet and peaceable enjoyment of it, not giving offence or scandal to the Government.*"

"*You are not to permit any Minister coming from England to preach in your Government, without a certificate from the Right Reverend the Bishop of London; nor any other Minister coming from any other part or place, without first obtaining leave from our Governor.*"

Mr. Attorney orders four of Mr. Makemie's hearers to be called—Captain John Theobalds, Mr. John Vanhorne, Mr. William Jackson, and Mr. Anthony Young—who answered to their names.

The defendant, perceiving they were summoned and called to give their evidence to the matter of fact, told the Court that the swearing of these four gentlemen as evidences would but give a needless trouble, and take up the time of the court, and he would own the matter of fact as to his preaching, and more than these gentlemen could declare upon oath; for he had done nothing therein that he was ashamed or afraid of, but would answer and own it, not only before this bar, but before the tribunal of God's final judgment. And so Mr. Attorney proposed, and Mr. Makemie answered the following questions, or to the same purpose:

Mr. Attorney. You own that you preached a sermon, and baptized a child at Mr. William Jackson's?

Francis Makemie. I did.

Mr. A. How many hearers had you?

F. M. I have other work to do, Mr. Attorney, than number my auditory when I am about to preach to them.

Mr. A. Were there above five hearing you?

F. M. Yes, and five to that.

Mr. A. Did you use the rites and ceremonies enjoined by, and prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer by the Church of England?

F. M. No; I never did, nor ever will, till I am better satisfied in my conscience.

Mr. A. Did you ask leave, or acquaint my Lord Carnbury with your preaching at York, when you dined with him at the Fort?

F. M. I did not know of my preaching at York when I dined with his Excellency; no, not for some days after. For when we came to York we had not the least intention or design of preaching there, but stopped at York purely to pay our respects to the Governor, which we did; but being afterwards called and invited to preach, as I was a Minister of the Gospel I durst not deny preaching, and I hope I never shall when it is wanting and desired.

Mr. A. Did you acquaint my Lord Carnbury with the place of your preaching?

F. M. As soon as I determined to preach, leave was asked, though not by me; for it was the people's business, and not mine, to provide a place for me to preach in. And I would have been admitted to preach in the Dutch church, but they were afraid of offending Lord Carnbury. And Anthony Young went to the Governor to have his leave or permission for my preaching in the Dutch church, though all this was done without so much as my knowledge. But my Lord opposing and denying it, I was under the necessity of preaching where I did, in a private house, though in a public manner, and with open doors.

Mr. Attorney, in pleading, first read over the indictment which the Grand Jury had found, and endeavored to prove the several parts thereof, by giving a large and full account of sundry statutes of King Henry VIII, asserting and establishing the supremacy of the King over all ecclesiastical persons and affairs in his dominion of England. And from thence asserted the Queen's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, and over ecclesiastical persons; which supremacy was by a delegation lodged in his Excellency our Governor, and which he is sworn to exercise; and this is signified to him by her Majesty's instructions, which were read in court. Then he produced, and read as much as was necessary of those statutes of Queen Elizabeth and King Charles II, for uniformity of worship, according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, and the penal laws against conventicles. He enlarged in his pleadings on these points, and, turning to the gentlemen of the Jury, he said, the matter of fact is plainly confessed by the defendant, and I have proved it to be repugnant to the Queen's instructions and sundry acts of Parliament; therefore, he did not doubt but that the Jury would find for the Queen against the defendant.

Mr. James Reigniere, attorney for the defendant, pleaded against the attorney for the Queen, in the following manner:

The indictment charges three distinct and separate facts as crimes against the defendant. First. That he, a pretended Protestant Minister, endeavoring to subvert the Queen's supremacy, jurisdiction, and authority in ecclesiastical affairs, did, privately and unlawfully, preach and teach at William Jackson's house, divers subjects, privately and unlawfully, to above five in number, without license had according to law, in derogation to the Royal authority and prerogative, to the evil example, &c. Cont. Par.

Secondly. That he did assemble divers unknown, and voluntarily and unlawfully use any other rites and forms of worship than are in the Common Prayer Book and the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England. Cont. Form. Stat.

Thirdly. That being not qualified by law to preach and teach in a congregation or meeting not allowed by law, in other manner than according

to the practice of the Church of England, at which meeting were five persons or more assembled. Cont. Form. Stat.

As to the indictment, ut supra, that the defendant did not preach privately nor the persons assembled privately, that is with doors locked, barred or bolted. Nay, it appears by the evidence, and agreed to the contrary by Mr. Attorney General. For people to meet unlawfully must appear by the violation of some known law or statute in force here, by which such meeting or preaching is forbidden, that is to say, the preaching to above five.

I take this colony as a dominion of England, to be governed by, and be subject to these three sorts of laws: 1st. The common law of England; 2d. The express statutes mentioning the plantations, and such others as are for public good, (as the Chief Justice was pleased to say in this Court in the case depending between Smith and Davis;) 3d. By the laws of this colony, and those are to be, as near as may be, agreeable to the laws and statutes of England; and the Judges of this Court (I dare say) will examine and determine no fact, but according to the mode and rule of some of those laws.

That preaching without license and assembling above five is a crime at common law, I never read; and it is not alleged to be against any statute; it must, then, be an offence against some law of this province, which as yet I never saw, and desire I may now see it; and if such does not appear to exist, then undoubtedly *where there is no law there can be no transgression.*

As to what is offered by Mr. Attorney, that the Queen, as supreme head of the church of England, hath power to make ordinances and punish for breach thereof, and that this power is delegated to the Governor, who is bound by oath to execute them—supposing and admitting all this, yet nothing like an ordinance appears. For the instructions produced by Mr. Attorney cannot have the force of a law or ordinance, especially against persons to whom they were never communicated, whatever they may be to those to whom they were given, who alone hath the custody of them and conceal them from public view.

As to the two articles in the indictment, Cont. Form. Stat. Now there are divers statutes made in England, which enjoin a due observance of the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, as, 1st Elizabeth, chapter 2d; 2d Elizabeth, chapter 1st, twenty pounds a month for not going to church; 29th Elizabeth, chapter 6th, the same; 3d James, chapters 4 and 5. But all these were pointed and levelled at Romish recusants only, though sometimes misconstrued to extend to others. Also, 35th Elizabeth, chapter 1st, forbidding all meeting of conventicles under penalty of abjuration and public submission; 16th Car., chapter 2d, now expired,

and the 22d Car., 2d. But all these are restricted to England, Wales, and Berwick on Tweed. But if they had not been so restricted, as they are positive and additional, they shall be confined strictly to place and words, then the practice in all the colonies and plantations, and the laws made in some of them, for the establishment of the Church of England. But there is no such establishment here; on the contrary, a law formerly made in this province, and in print, allowing liberty of conscience, which is in the following words. This is the last clause of an act of Assembly made in the government of New York, declaring the rights and privileges of the subject, viz:

"That no person or persons, who profess faith in God by Jesus Christ his only Son, shall at any time be any way molested, punished, disturbed, disquieted, or called into question for any difference in opinion or matter of religious concernment, who do not under that pretence disturb the civil peace of the province, &c. And that all and every such person and persons may, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, freely have and fully enjoy his or their opinion, persuasion, and judgment, in matters of conscience and religion, throughout all this province; and freely meet at convenient places within this province, and there worship according to their respective persuasions without being hindered or molested, they behaving themselves peaceably, quietly, modestly, and religiously, and not using their liberty to licentiousnesss nor to the civil injury or outward disturbance of others. Always provided, that nothing herein mentioned or contained shall extend to, or give liberty to any person of the Romish religion to exercise their manner of worship, contrary to the laws and statutes of their Majesties' kingdom of England."

And though Mr. Attorney endeavored to invalidate this by denying this law to be in force, yet could he not prove this law abolished. And by one part of the instructions which Mr. Attorney produced, in totidem verbis, is the same that has been given to former governors of this province, liberty of conscience is directed to be allowed.

And as to the third article in the indictment, that seems to refer to the 1st of William and Mary, of Toleration; but as we say the penal statutes did not extend hither, so is there no occasion of toleration. The laws and statutes of England, by their own force, extend equally to all plantations of England alike, and if these penal laws did extend to the plantations, then the Crown of England would never tolerate the governments of Boston, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and others, who, in their church discipline, are so far from conforming to the Church of England that they have set up and established another sort of church discipline universally among them. But, notwithstanding this, they are allowed the liberty they always used in their church without molestation, and were so allowed in the very

time when these penal laws were in force in England; but now, since by the late Act of Toleration, it was thought by the wise and experienced legislators of England to be for the public good to repeal those laws even there, for which place alone they were made, and to allow liberty of conscience, I hope it will never be thought that these penal statutes, so repealed, are or can be for the public good here, and as such extended hither. Wherefore, forasmuch as neither by the common law of England nor by any law of the province produced, or even pretended by Mr. Attorney, such preaching or meeting doth not appear unlawful, but on the contrary an express law of the province doth allow it, as hath been shewn, and that the penal laws and statutes of England against Dissenters can by no reasonable construction be extended hither, I humbly conceive, therefore, that my client is not guilty of any offence against law, and I hope and expect the Jury will acquit him accordingly.

Mr. William Nicholl, attorney for the defendant, pleaded in the next place as followeth: Mr. Attorney has been entertaining us with some history from the reign of King Henry VIII, and it is fit we should entertain him with some history also, more ancient and from better authors, and that is from the Acts of the Apostles. For we do find that teaching or preaching or speaking, in itself or by the common law, was never found a crime; for the Apostle Paul preached a very new doctrine to the Athenians, which was an ancient commonwealth, and was not condemned nor imprisoned for it, but they were curious to hear again, Acts 17th, concerning the new doctrine of the resurrection. But we find that when the same Apostle began to insist on any doctrine which tended to infringe the gain of the silversmiths who, Acts 18th, made shrines for Diana the goddess of the Ephesians, they were enraged and made an uproar against him, rushing into the theatre; but it was no crime either in Corinth or Athens, where no man was hurt by the doctrine itself, neither was obstructed by nor any offence taken by the civil government. And it is plain it was no offence to common law, but was made so by the old statute of 5th Richard 2d, chapter 5th; 2d Henry 4th, chapter 15th; 2d Henry 5th; but all these statutes being repealed by 1st Edward 6th, chapter 4th, and the acts of Elizabeth, it was still no transgression, but remains as it was, no crime at common law. And the four statutes against conventicles, in chapter 2d, are all local, and in express words limited to England, Wales, and Berwick on Tweed, and so have no relation to nor reach to any of the plantations.

And this is further manifest from the constitutions of the plantations being, as it were, settled by national consent, for those whose thoughts in religious affairs could not square with the public establishment in church government, discipline, and ceremonies; as, New England for Independents

and Presbyterians; Rhode Island and New Jersey, and we may add New York, for the several sorts of the Dissenters in general; Pennsylvania for Quakers, and Maryland for Papists in particular. And this being the first that was prosecuted in this nature in the plantations, is made the more remarkable, so long after the news of that harsh statute of Charles 2d had been cut up by the statute of 1st William and Mary.

And it is already evidently proved that the acts of the Assembly of New York allow liberty of conscience, with freedom of public worship to all but Papists.

What was offered on the other side by Mr. Attorney as being against the Queen's prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs, was foreign and not all to the purpose; for all the statutes relating to that matter being to assert the Queen's empire and jurisdiction over ecclesiastical persons, as well as laymen, in opposition to the claims and usurpation of the See of Rome, to exempt the clergy or churchmen from the civil and secular power.

And as to the Queen's instructions, they are not, neither can have the force of law; besides that these two instructions produced in court are no way against us, but rather for us.

Mr. David Jamison, attorney for the defendant, appeared next to plead. His defence was in the following manner:

Mr. Riegniere and Mr Nicholl, attorneys on the same side, having offered so many and large arguments, have left but little room for new matter to be offered, without enumerating what was offered upon the three heads of the indictment. As to the first, which was preaching and teaching without license, against the Queen's supremacy and prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs: We did not come here to approve or call in question the Queen's prerogative or supremacy, but were willing to pay all due respect and deference thereto. But we cannot see that these instructions from the Queen to my Lord Carnbury, of which Mr. Attorney has produced a copy, and which he alleges to be the law we have broken by preaching contrary to the Queen's instructions, which are not a law to any body else but to his lordship, who is directed by them, and is accountable to the Queen if he does not observe them. Her instructions are private directions to himself, and can be no law to others. Promulgation is that which gives the finishing stroke to a law. Nor do I see how his Lordship should become guilty of a breach of oath, as Mr. Attorney is pleased to offer, by not ordering the prosecution of this gentleman for preaching without his license, although he be sworn to obey and observe his instructions; because the very instructions produced give liberty of conscience to Protestant Dissenters, and are in two distinct paragraphs; the first of which seems to me wholly to agree with our act of Assembly of this provi

is to the same purpose, and very nearly in the same words. The other paragraph is negative: "*You are not to permit any Minister coming from England to preach in your government, without a certificate from the Right Rev'd the Bishop of London, nor any other Minister coming from any other place, without first obtaining leave from our Governor.*" And a Dissenting Minister preaching here without the Governor's knowledge could be no breach of his oath, because it was done without his knowledge, and consequently without his permission.

As to the second. The statutes of Elizabeth and Charles 2d against conventicles; they were limited or local acts or statutes, and could not any way reach to these plantations; for here in New York we have no established religion for the whole province. On the east end of Nassau or Long Island, were, and always have been, Independent Ministers; and the Dutch in like manner, and also the French, had their own way and Minister. The very Jews and Quakers have the free exercise of their religion. And there is not one form of worship established for the whole province. The 16th as well as the 22d of Charles 2d, are expressly limited to England, the dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick on Tweed; and therefore the using of any other form of worship in this province than what is contained in the Common Prayer, cannot be a breach of those statutes. Then, again, the 18th of Charles 2d for suppressing conventicles, makes the third default banishment for seven years into the plantations, (New England and Virginia excepted.) How then can it be supposed that the plantations, the very places to which the defaulters were to be banished, can be understood to be comprehended within the meaning and penalty of that statute, that did continue in force for little more time than four years. The other of the 22d did supply its room, and had much milder penalties.

As to the third—which is, that he preached without being qualified—that is laid against the Act of Toleration. I did offer that this statute was not nor is in force in the plantations generally, especially in this province, although there be no locality expressly mentioned therein—and that for these reasons: The title and whole design of it is *toleration*. Now toleration is an exception from some restraint. And since the penal laws are not in force here, by consequence, neither is the Act of Toleration of force. Here is no established church for the whole province, from which we should be tolerated. We have had liberty of conscience another way, and by an act of Assembly which was made in the beginning of the reign of William and Mary, during the government of Colonel Fletcher, not yet formally repealed.

Then, again, consider the preamble of the Act of Toleration: "*To the end that all our Protestant subjects may be united in interest and affec-*

tion," the wisdom of the nation did at that time combine to put an end to all persecntion on the score of religion. Our Assembly was much of the same mind, designing to prevent it; and so are all good men. When we did set about erecting a congregation of the Church of England in this town, and obtained a charter for the same of Governor Fletcher, although we were desirous to have the national worship among us, yet was it the care of those members who promoted it to get such clauses inserted in it as should secure the liberties of the Dutch and French congregations for our successors; and in an act of Assembly made since for its encouragement, the like care and precaution was had, which is still to be seen.

This province has not been more than about forty years in the possession of the Crown of England, and is made up chiefly of foreigners and dissenters, and persecution would not only tend to disunite us all, in interest and affection, but depopulate and weaken our strength, and discourage all such adventurers for the future. Therefore, as this prosecution is the first of this nature or sort which ever was known in this province, so it is hoped it may also be the last.

The defendant prayed that he might have liberty to speak for himself, which was granted, and he pleaded in his own defence the following arguments, which are in his own words:

F. Makemie. I am amazed to find Mr. Attorney so much changed in his opinion; for when I was before my Lord Carnbury, who told us the Act of Toleration was limited and local, and extended not to the plantations, Mr. Attorney was pleased to confirm it by asserting the same thing, and went a little further, by producing an argument to strengthen his opinion that the penal laws of England did not extend to the plantations, and the Act of Toleration was made to take off the edge of the penal laws; therefore, the toleration does not extend hither. But we find soon after, by an indictment, both the penal laws and the toleration reach hither, and all their penalties too.

The Hon. Chief Justice, Roger Mompesson, Esq., here interrupted the defendant, by saying: Gentlemen, do not trouble the Court with what passed between you before my Lord, or at any other time, but speak directly to the point.

F. Makemie. May it please your honor, I hope to make it appear that it is to the point; and what was Mr. Attorney's argument then, is now mine. For whatever opinion I was of, while an absolute stranger to New York and its constitution, now, since I have informed myself thoroughly with its constitution, I am entirely of Mr. Attorney's opinion, and hope he will be of the same still.

And as to the indictment, to return to the particulars thereof. First. I-

am charged with contemning and endeavoring to subvert the supremacy of the Queen in ecclesiastical affairs. As to the Queen's supremacy about ecclesiastical persons and things, we allow and believe she has as large a supremacy as in the Word of God is allowed to any Christian Kings or Princes in the world; and our confession of faith,* which will compare with any in the world, and is universally known to the Christian world, is very full in this matter, a part whereof it is judged necessary here to introduce for the information of many.

Chapter 23d. Concerning the Civil Magistrate: "1st. God, the supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under him, over the people, for his own glory and the public good; and, to this end, hath armed them with the civil power of the sword, for the defence and encouragement of them that do well, and for the punishment of evil doers.

3d. The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the church; that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, and all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed; all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented and reformed; and all the ordinances of God be settled; for the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.

4th. It is the duty of people to pray for magistrates; to honor their persons; to obey their lawful commands; and to be subject to their authority for conscience sake. Infidelity, or difference in religion, does not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from the due obedience to him; from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted; much less hath the Pope any power or jurisdiction over them in their dominions, or over any other people, and least of all to deprive them of their dominions or lives, if he should judge them to be heretics, or upon any pretence whatsoever."

And in all which Mr. Attorney has offered concerning the Queen's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, I cannot learn one argument or one word

* The Rev. Francis Makemie having been ordained as a Presbyterian Minister in Europe, as well as Mr. Hampton, both of them at their ordination had received and adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith, in toto; and this was, no doubt, his meaning here. But it does not hence follow that all his co-Presbyters, with whom he was here associated, many of whom had been Congregationalists from the beginning, and were so still in their preference of a form of government, had adopted it with the same extent, though they always had adhered to its doctrinal opinions.

from all the quoted statutes, that preaching a sermon is the least contempt or overthrow of the supremacy. And I hope it is not now unknown to any, that the oath of supremacy has been abolished by a law ever since the revolution, and consequently the subjects of the Government must be delivered from some obligation thereby, and how far this will be considered to extend, I leave to the Judges to determine. And as to my preaching without license first obtained from Lord Carnbury, which is asserted to be against law, I cannot hear, from any law yet produced, that Lord Carnbury has any power or directions to grant a license to any Dissenters, or that any of them are under any obligations to take license from his Lordship before they preach or after. Mr. Attorney pretends no law, unless he concludes the Queen's instructions to be law, or to have the force of a law. That they have not the force of a law has been abundantly proved already; neither am I any way culpable, even from the Queen's instructions which have been produced in court; for they consist of two parts, and are rather two distinct instructions, not relating at all to the same persons. In the first place, his Excellency is required to permit a liberty of conscience to all persons except Papists. And this is the liberty allowed to Dissenters, and which we claim by virtue of this instruction; and here is no license mentioned or required. For permission is a negative act, and implies no more than this: You shall so allow it as not to hinder, molest, or disquiet them, but rather protect them in it. And Papists being particularly expressed, it cannot be applied to the Church of England; therefore Dissenters are intended by this instruction, and no others; and if this permission is granted us, according to the express words thereof, we desire no more. And it cannot be esteemed by any, that imprisoning and punishing us at such a rate for preaching one sermon, is a permitting us liberty of conscience.

The other distinct paragraph, or rather the other instruction, which though joined together in this copy, are at a considerable distance from one another in the original, as we really found it so in a copy of instructions to a former Governor. And as the former concerns Dissenters, so this is intended for the clergy of the Church of England; for the words of the instruction, as you have it above, are these: "*You are not to permit any Minister coming from England to preach in your Government, without a certificate from the Right Reverend the Bishop of London, nor any other Minister coming from any other part or place, without first obtaining leave from you our Governor.*" Here is another instruction which should not be produced or improved against Dissenters; for all mankind, even those of the meanest capacity, must conclude and determine that this concerns only the clergy of the Church of England, who, by their constitution, are under strict obligations to take license or certificate from their

ordinary—and such as come to the plantations acknowledge the Bishop of London alone as such; and no Dissenter, either in England or any where else in the Queen's dominions, ever took, or ever was under any obligations to take, a license from the Queens or Kings of England, or any other person or persons whatsoever, until a method and practice has of late been erected and forced into practice at New York. For if our liberty either depended upon a license or certificate from the Bishops of England, or the Governors of America, we should soon be deprived of our liberty of conscience secured to us by law, and repeated resolutions of our present sovereign and gracious Queen, "*inviolably to maintain the toleration*," which she is pleased to signify in all her royal instructions to all her Governors abroad; which we are the more assured of from the instructions produced in this court. So that, as the first clause of this latter instruction cannot be applied to any other Ministers but of the Church of England, so the latter clause can be understood of no other but the same sort or species as those who came from England with certificates from the Bishop of London. And it is well known there are Ministers of the Church of England who may come, and who do come not directly from England, but from some other place—as from sundry plantations in America; as Mr. Sharp, now chaplain at Fort Anne, came not directly from England but from Maryland. And I must confess, he being a Minister of the Church of England, and enjoying a considerable benefice thereby, was obliged to comply with the constitution of his own church, and take a license from Lord Carnbury, if none could be produced from the Bishop of London. But all this is foreign to us, and not at all required of any Dissenter in Europe or America. And if there had been any thing in these instructions requiring Dissenters to take any license, or empowering Governors of the Plantations to grant them, which we do not find, then preaching a sermon before such license cannot be judged a crime, deserving such a confinement and prosecution as we have met with; for it has been already made to appear that those instructions cannot have the force of a law, to bind the subject to obedience, or render him culpable for disobedience, seeing *promulgation*, which is the life of the law, and which alone renders all persons inexcusable, never, as yet, has accompanied these instructions. So, if this be Mr. Attorney's law which we have broken by not obtaining license before preaching, I hope you, gentlemen of the jury, cannot but find we are no way culpable hereby, being neither inconsistent with the Queen's instructions and not against any law.

And as to the last part of the indictment, concerning the penal laws or the sundry statutes against conventicles, they never were designed nor intended by our English legislators for America, or any of the plantations

thereof; for they are limited and local acts, all of them restricted to England, Wales, and Berwick upon Tweed, as is manifest from the express words of said laws; neither have they ever been put in execution in any of the plantations till now;* yea, they have not been executed in England, Wales, or Berwick upon Tweed, for which they were calculated and made, these twenty years past. And when they were put in the most strict and rigorous execution in England, which was about the last of the reign of Charles II, the Dissenters in America lived very quiet, even in such plantations where the Church of England had a full and formal establishment. But, what is more to the point still, even the Roman Catholics, who are excluded from the benefit of the Act of Toleration in England, yet cannot be touched in America by these penal laws. For it is a matter of fact known to all, and I appeal to Mr. Reigniere, if Papists have not liberty and the exercise of their religion, without molestation from penal laws, and even in Maryland, where the Church of England has now a formal establishment, by laws made there. And it is manifestly known, the Assembly of Maryland made a late act against the Roman Catholics, and though it was never executed, because not approved of by the Queen, yet it is a plain demonstration, if the penal laws of England, originally and principally designed against Papish recusants, had extended to the plantations, there would have been no need for such an act of Assembly to be made against them in Maryland.

It is also a further argument that the penal laws never did extend to the plantations; because it was a penalty, in some of them, that persons, after sundry and so many convictions, are to be banished or transported to the American plantations as places removed beyond and free from the lash of penal laws; for to what purpose would their banishment be, if, after a removal from their native land, they should be lashed or ruined afresh by the same penal laws.

And if the penal laws of England do not extend to these plantations where the Church of England has a legal and formal establishment, it cannot be imagined they can take place where there is no particular church or persuasion established by law, and consequently all persuasions there are upon an equal bottom of liberty, as I find to be the case in New York, where there is not one act of the Assembly wherein the name or manner of worship, as it is in the Church of England, is so much as mentioned. And where there is no legal establishment, or any penalties or restrictions on the liberty of any Dissenters, there is no room for, or need of toleration,

* Mr. Makemie seems not to have been acquainted with what took place in Virginia in the years 1622 and 1623, when Missionaries from New England were banished the colony by the Governor of Virginia, under the same plea, and with the same spirit.

for where there is no penalty, what are we to be tolerated from?—from pure nullities or nothings, which would seem inconsistent with the thing itself? Therefore, in New York government, all persuasions there are upon an equal level and bottom of liberty, and this is confirmed to all Dissenters, except Papists, and allowed by an act of Assembly, already read in Court. And if Jews, who openly blaspheme the Lord Jesus—Quakers, and Lutherans, and all others, or most persuasions, are allowed even in this government, it is matter of wonder why we only should not be allowed of, but put to molestation, as we now are by my present prosecution. Is it because we are Protestants? Is it because we are nearest alike the established Church of England of any Dissenters? Is it because we are the most considerable body of Protestants in the Queen's dominions?* Is it because we have now, since the Union, a national establishment in Great Britain as nearly related and annexed to the Crown of England as the Church of England themselves? Sure, such proceeding, when known, will and must be a prodigy in England.

Mr. Attorney replied. It was impossible for any man to answer all that had been offered, there was so much said, and by so many.

The defendant told Mr. Attorney he verily believed it was impossible for him to answer what was said, and that it was a great truth which he had asserted.

Mr. Attorney proceeded as follows: These gentlemen on the other side assert, that all the penal laws of England are local, and limited to England, Wales, and Berwick upon Tweed; but I shall produce one that is not so, but extends to all the Queen's dominions; and that is, the Act of Uniformity made the 1st of Elizabeth, which is demonstrated from the very words of said law, "*or other places within this realm of England, Wales, and the marches of the same, and other the Queen's dominions.*" He then went to the instructions again, and endeavored to assert and vindicate the supremacy. He further said, the Kings and Queens of England enjoin and command their Governors to grant licenses; and it has always been customary, and an universal practice, to take licenses from Governors; and those Ministers who come from other places must be the same that my Lord is to allow liberty of conscience unto.

The defendant begged leave to answer Mr. Attorney as to his last argument. As to the 1st of Elizabeth, which is the Act of Uniformity, we acknowledge it was as extensive as the Queen's dominions in general, and

* Here Makemie again refers to the body of Presbyterians in Great Britain and Ireland, with whom he was connected before he came to America, and not to that small handful of Christians in America, which was just then beginning to form themselves into a Presbytery, and assume the name of Presbyterians.

not limited to England and Wales only, yet I hope to make it appear that this act does no way affect the plantations, and far less affect Dissenters, and therefore is altogether foreign to our present purpose. For, 1st. That act of Parliament was made the first year of the reign of Elizabeth, and consequently before any plantation had a being, or was thought of, and so could have no relation to them at all, they being pure non-entities at the time. 2d. All over the act, and in sundry places thereof, it is directed to Ministers, Parsons, or Vicars, in cathedrals, parish churches, private chapels, or oratories, and not a word in the whole act of Dissenters or Conventicles. For, 3d. At that time, when this license was made, there were not, strictly or properly speaking, any number of Dissenters in England who held separate meetings from the public and established worship; though there were those in the Church of England who always, from the beginning of the Reformation, scrupled the use of all the Common Prayer, and omitted some ceremonies, which was, and is to this day, the grounds of the separation; and it was to oblige such to a uniformity in public worship. And as soon as the act was made and put in execution, with all its penalties, many were discouraged, others cast out of the church for nonconformity, and this really made the separation; and all the mischiefs of the separation are originally owing to this act, though as soon as the separation was made, they could not touch Dissenters by the penalties of this act. Therefore they were under the necessity of making new acts of Parliament, in the following reigns, for punishing separated Dissenters; all of which were limited and local in express words, and never designed to pursue persecuted persons to the wilds of America. 4th. I am able to make it appear, if this Act of Uniformity were strictly put in execution, the most of the clergy of the Church of England would fall under its lashes and penalties; for none of them are to use any other rite, ceremony, or open prayer, but what is mentioned or set forth in the said Book of Common Prayer. And it is well known, the most valuable men in that church use another public prayer than is in the Common Prayer, and all such persons are so far Dissenters, and, being still in communion with the Church of England, are only liable to be prosecuted under this act.

As to the Queen's instructions, which Mr. Attorney insists so much upon, it was, and is obvious to every man, they were two distinct instructions, and though we have them placed so near in the copy, they have no affinity the one to the other; and it is not fair for Mr. Attorney to take the latter clause of one instruction and join it to another which was before; for this is a curtailing the Queen's instructions; whereas those who composed them knew better how to join them together than Mr. Attorney does.

And whereas Mr. Attorney affirms that giving and taking license was

very common and universal, I am well assured there never was, neither is to this day, any such practice in any plantation of America; and there were but few persons as yet in York government that had license; for, besides the two Dutch Ministers who differ upon Long Island, and it is said these licenses are the cause of their difference, there is but one English non-conformist Minister in all the government who has taken a license; and it is certain that Mr. Dubois and sundry others of the Dutch churches have no license, neither will they submit to any such as are granted.

Mr. Attorney, perceiving how matters then stood, moved that the Jury should bring in a special verdict, and the Judges inclined that way also; for, said Mr. Attorney, the matter of fact is plainly confessed by the defendant, as you have heard, and you are to bring it in specially, for the Jury are not judges of the law.

Mr. Makemie. *May it please your honors*, I am a stranger who lived four hundred miles from this place, and it is known to the whole country what intolerable trouble I have been put to already, and we cannot consent to a special verdict, for that would only increase my trouble, multiply my charges, and give me further delay. Besides, it is a known maxim in law "*that strangers are always to be favored with expedition in justice.*" This seems no way to admit of delay; and if this should be allowed of, no man's innocence would be able to protect him; for, if I should be cleared, I should suffer more in charges at last than if I were really guilty of many penal laws in England. And as to the Jury's judging of the law, and confessing the fact, I cannot see one point of the law to be judged; for that the penal laws are local and limited is owned on all hands; and penal laws are strictly to be taken and interpreted, and not allowed, to ruin the subject, to extend or be interpreted beyond the plain and strict sense of the words. It is also true that we have confessed preaching a sermon at the house of Mr. William Jackson, with all its true circumstances, but we have not owned this to be a crime, or repugnant to any law, or inconsistent with any of the Queen's instructions yet produced; neither has Mr. Attorney made any thing of this nature yet to appear; for all those ancient statutes of Henry VIII tend only to throw off the authority, supremacy, and jurisdiction of the Popes and See of Rome, and invest the Kings and Queens of England with that usurped authority of the Popes, and to bring ecclesiastical persons under the civil jurisdiction of England, who in times of Popery were made accountable only to the See of Rome and its jurisdiction; therefore they do not touch, neither are they any way applicable to this case.

Mr. Attorney. These gentlemen acknowledge and say that the Ministers of the Church of England are to take license, and are obliged so to

do; and, if so, the Dissenters should also, otherwise they must expect more favor and liberty than the Ministers of the Church of England.

Mr. Makemie. I must confess the cases are very different, for it is the doctrine and constitution of the Church of England that, notwithstanding their ordination, they are not to preach or officiate as Ministers until they procure or have a license from their Bishop or Ordinary, which no Dissenting Minister is concerned with; and they voluntarily and freely bring themselves under an oath of canonical obedience to obey their Ordinary; and if he should require them to take license, or any thing else, they must, they are sworn to submit thereto. But, finally: There is a great deal of reason why Ministers of the Church of England submit to license, but not so with us, for it is only *bare liberty* which Dissenters have. But the others have not only *liberty*, but a considerable *maintenance also*, without which I never knew any of them value *liberty only*. And Dissenters having liberty only, without any maintenance from Government, are not at all under obligations, neither is it required of them to take license of any one.

After a long debate and fair pleadings, the Honorable Roger Mompesson, Chief Justice, applied to the Jury to this effect:

Gentlemen: You have heard a great deal on both sides, and Mr. Attorney says the fact is confessed by the defendant, and I would have you to bring it in specially, for there are some points which I am not now prepared to answer. How far instructions may go, in having the force of a law, especially when not published or made known. And there is one objection made by Mr. Makemie, and that is, the oath of supremacy of England is abolished; and how far it will go in this matter, I confess I am not prepared to answer. If you will take upon you to judge of law, you may; or bring in the fact specially. This is the first instance that I can learn that there has been a trial or prosecution of this nature in America.

The Jury desired that the act of Assembly of New York might be delivered to them; and the defendant desired that the Jury might have the Queen's instructions also, which Mr. Attorney opposed and denied.

A Constable was then sworn to attend the Jury, who withdrew, and in a very short time returned again. The Jury is called, and find the defendant NOT GUILTY.

The Court then required reasons for the Jury's verdict. But the Chief Justice told the Jury they might give reasons if they would, or they might choose whether they would or not give any reasons for the verdict. The foreman told the Court that the defendant had not transgressed any law. Another member of the Jury told the Court that they believed, in their consciences, they had done the defendant justice. And so the verdict confirmed.

Mr. Réigniere, attorney for the defendant, moved that the defendant might be discharged—which was by the Chief Justice referred till tomorrow morning.

Saturday, June 7th. Ordered that the defendant be discharged, paying fees—and that his recognizance be likewise discharged.

A true copy: GEORGE CLARKE.

The defendant told the Court it was a hard case that an innocent person, and one found so upon trial and by law, and suffering so much already, and not only innocently, but for doing good, should pay such severe fees at last.

At length the defendant agreed to pay all just and legal fees to the Court and officers thereof, who acted indifferently in their several offices, as to this matter; but it was unreasonable he should pay his prosecutors whatever they were pleased to demand. For this would be nothing less than hiring our enemies to ruin us. But being the practice, as they affirmed, no argument would be received.

The defendant further told the Court, if he must pay fees, as he was a stranger, prayed he might not be left to the arbitrary demands of officers, but that the bill of cost might be produced and examined in open Court, and taxed by the Judges. But the Chief Justice declined it, as a thing which he did not concern himself about. It was therefore referred to Robert Milward, Esq., one of the Assistant Judges, who was to tax the bill, after notice given to the defendant or his attorney of the time and place to make objections. But the bill was taxed without any such notice given by the said Judge, who, instead of moderating any article, added two new ones. And their full amount was paid, and a copy of said amount denied the defendant, and a receipt upon payment refused, though paid in presence of two witnesses.

POSTSCRIPT. As there are preliminaries to the trial published, designed to obviate those misrepresentations which have been industriously circulated both at New York and elsewhere, to vindicate this new and unusual prosecution, so it is judged as necessary to add, by way of postscript or conclusion, for the information of America, copies of these following particulars: 1st. The Act of Assembly of New York for settling a ministry, and raising a maintenance for them only in some particular places of that government. 2d. A copy of that act of Parliament of England for punishing Governors of Plantations, in England, for crimes committed by them in the plantations. 3d. A copy of such licenses as are granted by Lord Carnbury to some Ministers. 4th. An account of the exorbitant charge for confinement and prosecution for preaching two sermons in New

York government. 5th. A copy of Mr. Makemie's certificate from a court in Virginia. To which will be added some illustrating animadversions—and so conclude this narrative.

1st. An act passed by the Assembly of New York, September 12th, 1693, entitled

An act for settling a Ministry, and for raising a maintenance for them in the city of New York, county of Richmond, Westchester, and Queen's County.

Whereas profaneness and licentiousness have of late overspread this province for want of a settled Ministry throughout the same, to the end the same may be removed, and the ordinances of God duly administered, be it enacted by the Governor and Council and the Representatives, convened in General Assembly, and by the authority of the same, that in each of the respective cities and counties hereafter mentioned and expressed, there shall be called, inducted, and established a good sufficient Protestant Minister, to officiate and have care of souls, within one year next after the publication hereof. That is to say, in the city of New York, one; in the county of Richmond, one; in the county of Westchester, two; in Queen's county, two; one at Jamaica and the adjacent towns and farms; and another to have the care of Hampstead, and the next adjacent towns and farms.

And for their respective encouragement, *be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that there shall be annually, and once every year, collected and paid, for the maintenance of each of their respective Ministers, the respective sums hereafter mentioned. That is to say: for the city and county of New York, one hundred pounds; for the two precincts of Westchester, one hundred pounds, to each fifty, to be paid in country produce at money price; for the county of Richmond, forty pounds, in country produce at money price; and for the two precincts of Queen's county, one hundred and twenty pounds, to each sixty, in country produce at money price. And for the more orderly raising the respective maintenances for the Ministers aforesaid, *be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that the respective Justices of each city and county aforesaid, or any two of them, shall every year issue out their warrants to the Constable, to summon the freeholders of every city, county, and precinct aforesaid together, on the second Tuesday in January, for the choosing of ten vestry-men and two church-wardens, and the said Justices and vestry-men, or a major part of them, are hereby empowered within ten days after the said day or any day after, as to them shall seem convenient, to lay a reasonable tax on the said respective cities, counties, parishes, or pre-

cincts, for the maintenance of the Minister and poor of the respective places; and if they shall neglect to issue their warrants, so as the election be not made that day, they shall respectively forfeit five pounds, current money of the province; and in case the said freeholders, duly summoned as aforesaid, shall not appear, or, appearing, do not choose the said ten vestry-men and two church-wardens, that then, in their default, the said Justices shall, within ten days after the second Tuesday, or in any day after as shall seem to them convenient, lay the said reasonable tax on the said respective maintenances aforesaid: and if the said Justices and vestry-men shall neglect their duty herein, they shall respectively forfeit five pounds current money aforesaid.

And be it enacted further by the authority aforesaid, that such of the Justices and vestry-men that shall not be present, at the time appointed to make such tax, and thereof be convicted by a certificate under the hands of such as do appear, and have no sufficient excuse for the same, shall respectively forfeit five pounds current money aforesaid; and a roll of the tax so made shall be delivered into the hands of the respective Constables of the said cities, counties, parishes, or precincts, with a warrant signed by any two Justices of the Peace empowering him or them to levy the said tax; and, upon refusal, to distrain and sell for public outcry, and pay the same into the hands of the church-wardens, retaining to himself *twelve pence per pound* for levying thereof. And if any person shall refuse to pay that which he is assessed, and the said Constable do strain for the same, all his charges shall be paid him, with such further allowance for his pains as the said Justices, or any of them, shall judge reasonable. Or if the said Justice or Justices shall neglect to issue the said warrant, he or they respectively shall forfeit five pounds current money aforesaid. And if the said Constable, or any of them, shall fail of their duty herein, they shall respectively forfeit five pounds current money aforesaid. And the church-wardens so chosen shall undertake the said office, and receive and keep a good account of the money or goods levied by virtue of this act, and the same issue by order from the said Justices and vestry-men of the respective cities, counties, precincts, or parishes aforesaid, for the purposes and intents aforesaid, and not otherwise. And the church-wardens shall, as often as thereunto required, yield an account unto Justices and vestry-men of all their receipts and disbursements; and in case the church-wardens or any of them shall neglect their duty herein, they shall respectively forfeit five pounds, current money aforesaid, for every refusal.

And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the said church-wardens, in their respective precincts aforesaid, shall by warrant as aforesaid, pay unto the respective Ministers the maintenance aforesaid,

by four equal and quarterly payments, under the penalty of five pounds current money aforesaid for each neglect, refusal, or default; the one-half of such forfeitures shall be disposed of to the use of the poor in each respective precinct where the same doth arise, and the other half to him or them that shall prosecute the same.

Always provided, that all and every the respective Ministers that shall be settled in the respective cities, &c. shall be called to officiate in their respective precincts aforesaid by the respective vestry-men and churchwardens. *And always provided*, that all former agreements made with Ministers throughout this province shall continue and remain in full force and virtue, any thing contained herein to the contrary notwithstanding.

Here follows

An Act to punish Governors of Plantations in this Kingdom for crimes by them committed in the Plantations.

Whereas a due punishment is not provided for several crimes and offences committed out of his Majesty's realm of England, whereof divers Governors, Lieutenant Governors, Deputy Governors, or Commanders in Chief of Plantations and Colonies, within his Majesty's dominions beyond the seas, have taken advantage, and have not been deterred from oppressing his Majesty's subjects within their respective governments and command, nor from committing several other great crimes and offences, not deeming themselves punishable for the same here, nor accountable for such their crimes and offences to any persons within their respective governments and commands: For remedy whereof, be it enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, that if any Governor, Deputy Governors, or Commanders shall, after the 1st day of August, 1700, be guilty of oppressing any of his Majesty's subjects beyond the seas, within their respective governments or commands, or shall be guilty of any other crime or offence, contrary to the laws of this realm, or in force within their respective governments or commands, such oppressions, crimes, and offences shall be inquired of, heard, and determined in his Majesty's Court of King's Bench here in England, or before such Commissioners and in such county of this realm as shall be assigned by his Majesty's Commission, and by good and lawful men of the same county; and that such punishment shall be inflicted on such offender, as is usually inflicted for offences of like nature committed here in England.

A copy of a Minister's license granted by Lord Carnbury.

By his Excellency Edward Viscount Carnbury, Captain General, &c.

"To ——— Greeting: I do hereby license and tolerate you to be Minister of the —— Congregation at —— in —— county, in the province

of New York: and to have and exercise the liberty and use of your religion, pursuant to her Majesty's pleasure therein, signified to me in her royal instructions, for and during so long a time as to me shall seem meet. And all Ministers and others are hereby required to take notice thereof.

Given under my hand and seal at Fort Anne, in New York, this — day of —— in the —— year of her Majesty's reign Anno Domini

CARNBURY.

A copy of a certificate from the Court of Accomack county in Virginia, read by Lord Carnbury before commitment of Francis Makemie for preaching a sermon at York.

Accomack County, sc. These may certify to all to whom these presents may concern, That Mr. Francis Makemie, a Dissenter and Preacher in the aforesaid county of Accomack, hath, at a court held in the aforesaid county October 5th, 1699, performed and answered by taking the oaths, &c. enjoined by a certain act of Parliament, made the 24th day of May, Anno Domini 1689, in the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary, entitled an act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the penalties of sundry laws. And by his application to the court, by petition, obtained order in October court last, that his own house at Accomack-Town, and his dwelling-house at Pocomoke, should be registered and recorded to be the first place of his constant and ordinary preaching. Which is attested, this 10th day of October, Anno Domini 1699.

Per me, JOHN WASHBAUM,
Clerk Car. Com. Accomack.

An account of the charges of the imprisonment of Francis Makemie and John Hampton, and prosecution of the former, for preaching a sermon at New York city.

	£	s.	d.
To Thomas Cardale, Sheriff of Queen's county on Long Island, for apprehending and bringing us before Lord Carnbury, at Fort Anne,	04	01	00
To charges at Jamaica, whither we were carried out of the way,	00	12	00
To expenses at White Hall tavern while attending Lord Carnbury's leisure, besides what sundry friends spent,	00	02	08
To Ebenezer Wilson, High Sheriff, for commitment to his house,	04	01	00

To extraordinary expenses during time of imprisonment,	06	00	00
To Mr. James Riegniere, for a retaining fee,	01	13	09
To a fee at another time,	03	06	00
To Ebenezer Wilson, Sheriff, for accommodations,	13	05	06
To ditto for return and habeas corpus,	04	01	00
To Chief Justice, when we gave recognizance,	01	16	00
To ditto after the first term,	00	18	00
To Mr. William Nicholl, for pleading,	02	12	00
To ditto still due, but now ordered him,	01	10	00
To my expenses in returning with my man from Virginia, by land and water, to attend the trial at New York,	12	06	06
To the Sheriff, for a copy of the panel,	00	05	06
To Mr. Attorney for the Queen, though cleared,	12	12	06
To Mr. Secretary, for fees,	05	12	06
To the High Sheriff, for fees after trial,	01	10	00
To the Judge,	01	00	00
To Judge Millward, for taxing the bill of cost, I think,	00	12	00
To the Crier and Under Sheriff,	00	10	00
To Mr. Riegniere, for his pains in writing and pleading,	05	00	00
Sum total,	£83	07	06

REMARKS UPON THE POSTSCRIPT.

In this postscript, there is, first, the only establishing act of New York, which the clergy of the Church of England have laid hold upon, and thereby would deceive the world, in imposing upon not only the American but European world, that they are established in the New York Government as in England; but would also influence that noble corporation or society for propagating the Gospel, or the patrons of most of them, to break the fifth commandment in Stubb's scheme. And though the foregoing trial has opened the eyes and undeceived most, if not all at New York, in this matter, for which they may thank a prison; so this is to enlighten, not only those that are abroad in the world, but also to influence and direct the Assemblies of New York for the future, in not giving a handle to any to pervert their laws, contrary to the intention of the legislators; or confirming by subsequent acts their unjust possessions; all which they may perceive from the following particulars:

1st. This law is not general, for the whole government, but for four counties of the colony, where there are nine; so that the largest share is yet without the benefits of this act. 2d. It was made upon the motion and application of sundry Dissenters on Long Island, who are yet alive, who ex-

pected another benefit by it than they have since been treated with. 3d. It was made by an Assembly who were generally Dissenters, and who are so to this day; and let such as are alive declare their design in this law. 4th. There is not any mention of so much as the name of the Church of England, or the mode or manner of the Church of England's worship, government, or ceremonies, in all the law, without which I cannot imagine they can have an establishment. 5th. Every sufficient Protestant Minister, duly called according to directions of said law, has a right hereunto, and none else; and that Dissenters, for whom this law was originally designed, and from whom it emanated, are deemed and called Ministers of the Gospel, and men in holy orders, is plain from the express words of the Act of Toleration itself. 6th. None have a right unto, or should have any benefit from this act, but he that is called and chosen by twelve men, who are chosen themselves by the free votes of the people of the county, which *Mr. Urquart, of Jamaica*, never had, by any vote of the majority; therefore, he has as great a right to the salary there, and no more, as he has to the meeting-house, with the house and land he lives upon, from which the true proprietors have been ousted with violence, without a legal process or ejectment, which property is of £1500 value. It is a matter of satisfaction that this is as yet a solitary case, though it is likely to be made a precedent of, for *Newtown* is threatened by the *Parson*. 7th. It is observable that, at the time this law was made, there was not one clergyman of the Church of England in all that country, and for some time afterwards. 8th. As no person had a right by this law but such as were legally called and chosen, so, consequently, it was no crime for the vestry to refuse levying or paying money to such as had no right. 9th. By English law and practice, no vestry-man was to be fined as culpable, until legally convicted of the crime or matter of fact. 10th. By the last clause of this law, all former agreements made between Ministers and people were confirmed and ratified, and all such were then, and are to this day, Dutch, French, and British Dissenters. So much concerning the New York act of Assembly. And as to the English act of Parliament, I shall say nothing, but leave that to the Queen's Bench, and the learned Judges there, when the *crimeless mittimus*, and still further order comes to be tried by them.

The next document in this postscript is a copy of a New York license, and which was not so common and general to Dissenters as Mr. Attorney asserted at the trial; for if they were all called in, they would make but a small number; and any one may have them for half the money they cost; and with some, not so easily swallowed down as conformity itself, from which we dissent, and for these reasons: 1st. If we were not Ministers before, this license can never make us so. 2d. No such instructions from

the Queen were produced at the trial, as laid upon Dissenters as being under any obligation of taking license. 3d. By this license, they are only tolerated to exercise their religion in one congregation, and not allowed to preach to any people in the whole government, who shall desire it, which no Minister in his right wits, for the future, will submit to. 4th. It is a most precarious liberty which is granted, not *quam diu bene se gesserit*, but *during pleasure*, which is inconsistent with that commission and authority which Ministers of the Gospel, called of God, derive from the Lord Jesus Christ, the great head and king of his militant churches. Therefore, it is from a principle of conscience, and not from any contempt of government, or disrespect to the persons of any authority, that they cannot; that they dare not submit to such a license; so inconsistent with the toleration and that liberty of conscience allowed in Britain, and practised in all the Queen's dominions, besides New York, and commanded to be allowed by the Queen's instructions.

The next thing to be noticed in this postscript is a copy of Mr. Makemie's certificate, from a court of record in the dominion of Virginia, which was produced to and read by Lord Carnbury before confinement, and shown to the grand jury before the presentment was found; and though Mr. Attorney told the said jury, while four of the hearers were examining upon oath concerning the sermon, *that this certificate was written under a hedge*, which no doubt influenced them to have no regard to it, yet if the Act of Toleration, and consequently this certificate, had come in play at the trial, he was armed with an exemplification from the government, signed by the President, and seal of the colony annexed, to prove the truth and validity of this certificate, and vindicate it from the charge of forgery.

The last thing is an account of the expenses, of not only a person who was innocent, *but for doing good*, as was determined by the trial, and for complying with the most solemn obligations of duty, both to God and to the souls of men. To which, besides the loss of time and absence from his family and concerns, he might have justly charged twelve pounds more of money by being necessitated to make his escape both by land and water to New England, from officers with new precepts, whereby a whole Sabbath was profaned in seeking to apprehend him; and for which some have assumed a fearful accountability.

But it is plain and undeniable that the prosecution of the most innocent person in the world, at New York, is more expensive than if Mr. Makemie had been guilty of all the penal laws mustered up in the indictment against one sermon, if prosecuted in England even while those penal laws were in force and executed there.

Besides, a fair and legal decision cannot put an end to a controversy

here, where the same fact is made criminal, and a new process violently designed, and vigorously aimed at, by such persons as nothing but the interposition of the authority of England would put a stop to.

And what legal authority Mr. Attorney and a perpetual Sheriff can have for their demanded fees, I shall leave to the regulated table of fees for New York to determine; while this now imposed is not to be paralleled by any colony in her Majesty's dominions.

In regard that all opportunities have been denied to the above said Mr. Makemie for his own vindication, it is thought proper here to subjoin a copy of his letter to Lord Carnbury, and to which no regard was had nor answer given. This letter was written after he had made his escape from New York, and fled to New England to avoid being arrested the second time, and is dated

BOSTON, *July 28th*, 1707.

May it please your Lordship: I most humbly beg leave to represent to your Excellency my just astonishment at the information received from sundry hands, since my arrival in these colonies: and after so long and so expensive a confinement—so deliberate and fair a trial, before Judges of your Lordship's appointment, and by a Jury chosen by your own Sheriff on purpose to try the matter—I have been legally cleared, and found guilty of no crime for preaching a sermon at New York; though my innocence should have protected me from unspeakable and intolerable expense, yet I am informed, may it please your Excellency, there are orders and directions given to sundry officers in the Jerseys for apprehending me, and a design of giving me fresh trouble at New York.

If I were assured of the true cause of your Lordship's repeated resentments against me, I doubt not but my innocence would not only effectually justify me, but remove those unjust impressions imposed on your Lordship by some persons about you.

And as to my preaching—being found at the trial to be against no law, nor any ways inconsistent with her Majesty's instructions produced there; and considering the solemn obligations I am under, both to God and the souls of men, to embrace all opportunities of exercising those ministerial gifts vouchsafed to me from Heaven—to whom I do appeal—I have no other end, besides the glory of God and the eternal good of precious souls: I must assure myself your Lordship insists *not on this now as a crime*, especially in New York government, where all Protestants are upon an equal level of liberty, and where there exists no legal establishment for any particular persuasion.

I hear that I am charged with the *Jersey paper called Forget and Forgive*. Though the proving a negative in my just vindication be an hard

task, and not an usual requisition or undertaking, yet why should there be any doubt about the thing itself; the matter it contains being altogether foreign from me, and no way concerning me; the time of its publication, being so soon spread abroad after my arrival, I am well assured that none dare legally accuse me, while the real authors are smiling at your Lordship's mistake and imposition. Your informers deserve to be stigmatised with the severest marks of your Lordship's displeasure; and the authors will find a time to confront my sworn accusers of perjury; and besides that, I never saw it until about the last of February.

We have suffered greatly in our reputations, and particularly by being branded with the character of *Jesuits;* though my universal known reputation, both in Europe and America, makes me easy under such invidious imputations. I have been represented to your Lordship as being *factious*, both in the government of Virginia and Maryland. I have peaceably lived in Virginia; I have brought from Maryland a certificate of my past reputation, signed by some men of the best quality in the most contiguous county, ready to be produced at the trial, if there had been occasion for it. A copy of which I shall presume to enclose for your Lordship's perusal and satisfaction.

I beg leave to represent to your Lordship my just concern at the sundry precepts for apprehending me, both in York and the Jerseys, as one of the greatest criminals; whereby I am prevented in performing my ministerial duties to many in your Lordship's government of my own persuasion, who desire it.

I shall patiently expect your Lordship's commands and directions, in giving me an opportunity for vindicating myself in what is charged against me, and being always ready to comply with any qualification enjoined and required by law.

I beg leave of your Lordship, to subscribe myself,

Your Excellency's most humble and most obedient servant,

FRANCIS MAKEMIE.

It may be thought by many that it was unnecessary to waste time and paper in publishing the following antiquated act; but as so much use has been made of this and other acts, and such frequent reference is made to them in this history of the church, it was judged indispensable to a right understanding of the allusions to them. Besides, it is hardly credible, except by one who has had his attention called to this subject, that there should be such ignorance, in many persons who may pass for men of intelligence, respecting this and similar acts, which had such influence in the affairs of the church at the time. It is a fact that a lawyer of some distinction, who bore a conspicuous part in the General Assembly of 1837, and in the excinding acts passed that year, as well as in other judicatories of the church, when referring to the Act of Toleration, spoke of it as an act that was passed by the Virginia Legislature when the old establishment of the Episcopal Church of England was abolished by that body, and confounded it with the act of religious freedom which was then passed, and knew not that there was any difference between them until he was set right upon the occasion.

1st. The Toleration Act, entitled an act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the penalties of certain laws, passed 1st William and Mary, chapter 18, 1689.

Forasmuch as some ease to scrupulous consciences in the exercise of religion may be an effectual means to unite their Majesties' Protestant subjects in interest and affection,*

1st. Be it enacted by the King and Queen's most excellent Majesties, and with the advice and consent of the Lords, spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that neither the statute made in the twenty-third year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth,† entitled "an act to retain the Queen Majesty's subjects in their due obedience;" nor that statute made in the twenty-ninth year of the said Queen,‡ entitled "an act for the more speedy and due execution of certain branches of the statute made in the twenty-third year of the Queen Majesty's reign," viz. the aforesaid act; nor that branch or clause of a statute made in the first year of the reign of the said Queen,‖ entitled "an act for the uniformity of common prayer, and services in the church, and administration of the sacraments," whereby all persons, having no lawful and reasonable excuse to be absent, are required to resort to their parish church, or chapel, or to some usual place where the common prayer shall be used, upon pain of punishment by the censures of the church, and also upon the pain that every person so offending shall forfeit for every such offence twelvepence; nor that statute made in the third year of King James I,¶ entitled "an act for the better discovering and repressing

* 1st William and Mary, chap. 18.
† 23d Elizabeth, chap. 1st.
‡ 29th Elizabeth, chap. 6th.
‖ 29th Elizabeth, chap. 2d, § 14.
¶ 3d James 1st, chap. 4th.

Popish recusants;" nor that after statute, made in the same year,* entitled "an act to prevent and avoid dangers which may grow by Popish recusants;" nor any other law or statute of this realm made against Papists or Popish recusants, except the statute made in the twenty-fifth year of King Charles II,† entitled "an act for preventing dangers which may happen from Popish recusants," and except also the statute made in the thirtieth year of the said King Charles II,‡ entitled "an act for he more effectual preserving the King's person and government by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament," shall be construed to extend to any person or persons dissenting from the Church of England that shall take the oaths mentioned in a statute made this present Parliament,§ entitled "an act for removing and preventing all questions and disputes concerning the assembling and sitting of the present Parliament," shall make and subscribe the declaration mentioned in a statute made the thirtieth year of Charles II, entitled "an act to prevent Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament;" which oaths and declarations the Justices of Peace, at the General Sessions of the Peace to be held for the county or place where such person shall live, are hereby required to tender and administer to such persons as shall offer themselves to take, make, and subscribe the same, and thereof to keep a register. And likewise none of the persons aforesaid shall give or pay, as any fee or reward, to any officer or officers belonging to the court aforesaid, above the sum of sixpence, nor that more than once, for his or their entry of his taking the said oaths and making and subscribing the said declaration; nor above the further sum of sixpence for any certificate of the same, to be made out and signed by the officer or officers of the said court.

2d. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that all and every person and persons already convicted, or prosecuted in order to conviction of recusancy, by indictment, information, action of debt, or otherwise, grounded upon the aforesaid statutes, or any of them, that shall take the said oaths mentioned in the said statutes made this present Parliament, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, in the Court of Exchequer, or Assize, or General or Quarter Sessions, to be held for the county where such person lives, and to be thence respectively certified into the Exchequer, shall be thenceforth exempted and discharged from all the penalties, seizures, forfeitures, judgments, and executions incurred by the force of any of the aforesaid statutes, without any compensation for, or further charge whatever.

3d. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that all and every person and persons that shall as aforesaid take the said oaths, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, shall not be liable to any pains, penalties, or forfeitures mentioned in an act made in the thirty-fifth year of the late Queen Elizabeth,‖ entitled "an act to retain the Queen Majesty's subjects in obedience," nor in an act made in the twenty-second year of the late King Charles II,¶ entitled "an act to prevent and suppress seditious conventicles." Nor shall any of the said persons be prosecuted in any ecclesiastical court, for or by reason of their non-conformity to the Church of England.

* 3d James 1st, chap. 5th.
† 25th Charles 2d, chap. 2d.
‡ 30th Charles 2d, stat. 2d, chap. 1st.
§ Id.
‖ 35th Elizabeth, chap. 1st.
¶ 22d Charles 2d, chap. 1st.

of New York: and to have and exercise the liberty and use of your religion, pursuant to her Majesty's pleasure therein, signified to me in her royal instructions, for and during so long a time as to me shall seem meet. And all Ministers and others are hereby required to take notice thereof.

Given under my hand and seal at Fort Anne, in New York, this — day of —— in the —— year of her Majesty's reign Anno Domini

CARNBURY.

A copy of a certificate from the Court of Accomack county in Virginia, read by Lord Carnbury before commitment of Francis Makemie for preaching a sermon at York.

Accomack County, &c. These may certify to all to whom these presents may concern, That Mr. Francis Makemie, a Dissenter and Preacher in the aforesaid county of Accomack, hath, at a court held in the aforesaid county October 5th, 1699, performed and answered by taking the oaths, &c. enjoined by a certain act of Parliament, made the 24th day of May, Anno Domini 1689, in the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary, entitled an act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the penalties of sundry laws. And by his application to the court, by petition, obtained order in October court last, that his own house at Accomack-Town, and his dwelling-house at Pocomoke, should be registered and recorded to be the first place of his constant and ordinary preaching. Which is attested, this 10th day of October, Anno Domini 1699.

Per me, JOHN WASHBAUM,
Clerk Car. Com. Accomack.

An account of the charges of the imprisonment of Francis Makemie and John Hampton, and prosecution of the former, for preaching a sermon at New York city.

	£	s.	d.
To Thomas Cardale, Sheriff of Queen's county on Long Island, for apprehending and bringing us before Lord Carnbury, at Fort Anne,	04	01	00
To charges at Jamaica, whither we were carried out of the way,	00	12	00
To expenses at White Hall tavern while attending Lord Carnbury's leisure, besides what sundry friends spent,	00	02	08
To Ebenezer Wilson, High Sheriff, for commitment to his house,	04	01	00

To extraordinary expenses during time of imprisonment,	06	00	00
To Mr. James Riegniere, for a retaining fee,	01	13	00
To a fee at another time,	03	06	00
To Ebenezer Wilson, Sheriff, for accommodations,	13	05	06
To ditto for return and habeas corpus,	04	01	00
To Chief Justice, when we gave recognizance,	01	16	00
To ditto after the first term,	00	18	00
To Mr. William Nicholl, for pleading,	02	12	00
To ditto still due, but now ordered him,	01	10	00
To my expenses in returning with my man from Virginia, by land and water, to attend the trial at New York,	12	06	06
To the Sheriff, for a copy of the panel,	00	05	06
To Mr. Attorney for the Queen, though cleared,	12	12	06
To Mr. Secretary, for fees,	05	12	06
To the High Sheriff, for fees after trial,	01	10	00
To the Judge,	01	00	00
To Judge Millward, for taxing the bill of cost, I think,	00	12	00
To the Crier and Under Sheriff,	00	10	00
To Mr. Riegniere, for his pains in writing and pleading,	05	00	00
Sum total,	£83	07	06

Remarks upon the Postscript.

In this postscript, there is, first, the only establishing act of New York, which the clergy of the Church of England have laid hold upon, and thereby would deceive the world, in imposing upon not only the American but European world, that they are established in the New York Government as in England; but would also influence that noble corporation or society for propagating the Gospel, or the patrons of most of them, to break the fifth commandment in Stubb's scheme. And though the foregoing trial has opened the eyes and undeceived most, if not all at New York, in this matter, for which they may thank a prison; so this is to enlighten, not only those that are abroad in the world, but also to influence and direct the Assemblies of New York for the future, in not giving a handle to any to pervert their laws, contrary to the intention of the legislators; or confirming by subsequent acts their unjust possessions; all which they may perceive from the following particulars:

1st. This law is not general, for the whole government, but for four counties of the colony, where there are nine; so that the largest share is yet without the benefits of this act. 2d. It was made upon the motion and application of sundry Dissenters on Long Island, who are yet alive, who ex-

pected another benefit by it than they have since been treated with. 3d. It was made by an Assembly who were generally Dissenters, and who are so to this day; and let such as are alive declare their design in this law. 4th. There is not any mention of so much as the name of the Church of England, or the mode or manner of the Church of England's worship, government, or ceremonies, in all the law, without which I cannot imagine they can have an establishment. 5th. Every sufficient Protestant Minister, duly called according to directions of said law, has a right hereunto, and none else; and that Dissenters, for whom this law was originally designed, and from whom it emanated, are deemed and called Ministers of the Gospel, and men in holy orders, is plain from the express words of the Act of Toleration itself. 6th. None have a right unto, or should have any benefit from this act, but he that is called and chosen by twelve men, who are chosen themselves by the free votes of the people of the county, which *Mr. Urquart, of Jamaica*, never had, by any vote of the majority; therefore, he has as great a right to the salary there, and no more, as he has to the meeting-house, with the house and land he lives upon, from which the true proprietors have been ousted with violence, without a legal process or ejectment, which property is of £1500 value. It is a matter of satisfaction that this is as yet a solitary case, though it is likely to be made a precedent of, for *Newtown* is threatened by the *Parson*. 7th. It is observable that, at the time this law was made, there was not one clergyman of the Church of England in all that country, and for some time afterwards. 8th. As no person had a right by this law but such as were legally called and chosen, so, consequently, it was no crime for the vestry to refuse levying or paying money to such as had no right. 9th. By English law and practice, no vestry-man was to be fined as culpable, until legally convicted of the crime or matter of fact. 10th. By the last clause of this law, all former agreements made between Ministers and people were confirmed and ratified, and all such were then, and are to this day, Dutch, French, and British Dissenters. So much concerning the New York act of Assembly. And as to the English act of Parliament, I shall say nothing, but leave that to the Queen's Bench, and the learned Judges there, when the *crimeless mittimus*, and still further order comes to be tried by them.

The next document in this postscript is a copy of a New York license, and which was not so common and general to Dissenters as Mr. Attorney asserted at the trial; for if they were all called in, they would make but a small number; and any one may have them for half the money they cost; and with some, not so easily swallowed down as conformity itself, from which we dissent, and for these reasons: 1st. If we were not Ministers before, this license can never make us so. 2d. No such instructions from

the Queen were produced at the trial, as laid upon Dissenters as being under any obligation of taking license. 3d. By this license, they are only tolerated to exercise their religion in one congregation, and not allowed to preach to any people in the whole government, who shall desire it, which no Minister in his right wits, for the future, will submit to. 4th. It is a most precarious liberty which is granted, not *quam diu bene se gesserit*, but *during pleasure*, which is inconsistent with that commission and authority which Ministers of the Gospel, called of God, derive from the Lord Jesus Christ, the great head and king of his militant churches. Therefore, it is from a principle of conscience, and not from any contempt of government, or disrespect to the persons of any authority, that they cannot; that they dare not submit to such a license; so inconsistent with the toleration and that liberty of conscience allowed in Britain, and practised in all the Queen's dominions, besides New York, and commanded to be allowed by the Queen's instructions.

The next thing to be noticed in this postscript is a copy of Mr. Makemie's certificate, from a court of record in the dominion of Virginia, which was produced to and read by Lord Carnbury before confinement, and shown to the grand jury before the presentment was found; and though Mr. Attorney told the said jury, while four of the hearers were examining upon oath concerning the sermon, *that this certificate was written under a hedge*, which no doubt influenced them to have no regard to it, yet if the Act of Toleration, and consequently this certificate, had come in play at the trial, he was armed with an exemplification from the government, signed by the President, and seal of the colony annexed, to prove the truth and validity of this certificate, and vindicate it from the charge of forgery.

The last thing is an account of the expenses, of not only a person who was innocent, *but for doing good*, as was determined by the trial, and for complying with the most solemn obligations of duty, both to God and to the souls of men. To which, besides the loss of time and absence from his family and concerns, he might have justly charged twelve pounds more of money by being necessitated to make his escape both by land and water to New England, from officers with new precepts, whereby a whole Sabbath was profaned in seeking to apprehend him; and for which some have assumed a fearful accountability.

But it is plain and undeniable that the prosecution of the most innocent person in the world, at New York, is more expensive than if Mr. Makemie had been guilty of all the penal laws mustered up in the indictment against one sermon, if prosecuted in England even while those penal laws were in force and executed there.

Besides, a fair and legal decision cannot put an end to a controversy

here, where the same fact is made criminal, and a new process violently designed, and vigorously aimed at, by such persons as nothing but the interposition of the authority of England would put a stop to.

And what legal authority Mr. Attorney and a perpetual Sheriff can have for their demanded fees, I shall leave to the regulated table of fees for New York to determine; while this now imposed is not to be paralleled by any colony in her Majesty's dominions.

In regard that all opportunities have been denied to the above said Mr. Makemie for his own vindication, it is thought proper here to subjoin a copy of his letter to Lord Carnbury, and to which no regard was had nor answer given. This letter was written after he had made his escape from New York, and fled to New England to avoid being arrested the second time, and is dated

BOSTON, *July 28th*, 1707.

May it please your Lordship: I most humbly beg leave to represent to your Excellency my just astonishment at the information received from sundry hands, since my arrival in these colonies: and after so long and so expensive a confinement—so deliberate and fair a trial, before Judges of your Lordship's appointment, and by a Jury chosen by your own Sheriff on purpose to try the matter—I have been legally cleared, and found guilty of no crime for preaching a sermon at New York; though my innocence should have protected me from unspeakable and intolerable expense, yet I am informed, may it please your Excellency, there are orders and directions given to sundry officers in the Jerseys for apprehending me, and a design of giving me fresh trouble at New York.

If I were assured of the true cause of your Lordship's repeated resentments against me, I doubt not but my innocence would not only effectually justify me, but remove those unjust impressions imposed on your Lordship by some persons about you.

And as to my preaching—being found at the trial to be against no law, nor any ways inconsistent with her Majesty's instructions produced there; and considering the solemn obligations I am under, both to God and the souls of men, to embrace all opportunities of exercising those ministerial gifts vouchsafed to me from Heaven—to whom I do appeal—I have no other end, besides the glory of God and the eternal good of precious souls: I must assure myself your Lordship insists *not on this now as a crime*, especially in New York government, where all Protestants are upon an equal level of liberty, and where there exists no legal establishment for any particular persuasion.

I hear that I am charged with the *Jersey paper called Forget and Forgive*. Though the proving a negative in my just vindication be an hard

task, and not an usual requisition or undertaking, yet why should there be any doubt about the thing itself; the matter it contains being altogether foreign from me, and no way concerning me; the time of its publication, being so soon spread abroad after my arrival, I am well assured that none dare legally accuse me, while the real authors are smiling at your Lordship's mistake and imposition. Your informers deserve to be stigmatised with the severest marks of your Lordship's displeasure; and the authors will find a time to confront my sworn accusers of perjury; and besides that, I never saw it until about the last of February.

We have suffered greatly in our reputations, and particularly by being branded with the character of *Jesuits;* though my universal known reputation, both in Europe and America, makes me easy under such invidious imputations. I have been represented to your Lordship as being *factious*, both in the government of Virginia and Maryland. I have peaceably lived in Virginia; I have brought from Maryland a certificate of my past reputation, signed by some men of the best quality in the most contiguous county, ready to be produced at the trial, if there had been occasion for it. A copy of which I shall presume to enclose for your Lordship's perusal and satisfaction.

I beg leave to represent to your Lordship my just concern at the sundry precepts for apprehending me, both in York and the Jerseys, as one of the greatest criminals; whereby I am prevented in performing my ministerial duties to many in your Lordship's government of my own persuasion, who desire it.

I shall patiently expect your Lordship's commands and directions, in giving me an opportunity for vindicating myself in what is charged against me, and being always ready to comply with any qualification enjoined and required by law.

I beg leave of your Lordship, to subscribe myself,

Your Excellency's most humble and most obedient servant,

FRANCIS MAKEMIE.

It may be thought by many that it was unnecessary to waste time and paper in publishing the following antiquated act; but as so much use has been made of this and other acts, and such frequent reference is made to them in this history of the church, it was judged indispensable to a right understanding of the allusions to them. Besides, it is hardly credible, except by one who has had his attention called to this subject, that there should be such ignorance, in many persons who may pass for men of intelligence, respecting this and similar acts, which had such influence in the affairs of the church at the time. It is a fact that a lawyer of some distinction, who bore a conspicuous part in the General Assembly of 1837, and in the excinding acts passed that year, as well as in other judicatories of the church, when referring to the Act of Toleration, spoke of it as an act that was passed by the Virginia Legislature when the old establishment of the Episcopal Church of England was abolished by that body, and confounded it with the act of religious freedom which was then passed, and knew not that there was any difference between them until he was set right upon the occasion.

1st. The Toleration Act, entitled an act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the penalties of certain laws, passed 1st William and Mary, chapter 18, 1689.

Forasmuch as some ease to scrupulous consciences in the exercise of religion may be an effectual means to unite their Majesties' Protestant subjects in interest and affection,*

1st. Be it enacted by the King and Queen's most excellent Majesties, and with the advice and consent of the Lords, spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that neither the statute made in the twenty-third year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth,† entitled "an act to retain the Queen Majesty's subjects in their due obedience;" nor that statute made in the twenty-ninth year of the said Queen,‡ entitled "an act for the more speedy and due execution of certain branches of the statute made in the twenty-third year of the Queen Majesty's reign," viz. the aforesaid act; nor that branch or clause of a statute made in the first year of the reign of the said Queen,‖ entitled "an act for the uniformity of common prayer, and services in the church, and administration of the sacraments," whereby all persons, having no lawful and reasonable excuse to be absent, are required to resort to their parish church, or chapel, or to some usual place where the common prayer shall be used, upon pain of punishment by the censures of the church, and also upon the pain that every person so offending shall forfeit for every such offence twelvepence; nor that statute made in the third year of King James I.¶ entitled "an act for the better discovering and repressing

* 1st William and Mary, chap. 18.
‡ 29th Elizabeth, chap. 6th.
¶ 3d James 1st, chap. 4th.
† 23d Elizabeth, chap. 1st.
‖ 29th Elizabeth, chap. 2d, § 14.

Popish recusants;" nor that after statute, made in the same year,* entitled "an act to prevent and avoid dangers which may grow by Popish recusants;" nor any other law or statute of this realm made against Papists or Popish recusants, except the statute made in the twenty-fifth year of King Charles II,† entitled "an act for preventing dangers which may happen from Popish recusants," and except also the statute made in the thirtieth year of the said King Charles II,‡ entitled "an act for he more effectual preserving the King's person and government by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament," shall be construed to extend to any person or persons dissenting from the Church of England that shall take the oaths mentioned in a statute made this present Parliament,§ entitled "an act for removing and preventing all questions and disputes concerning the assembling and sitting of the present Parliament," shall make and subscribe the declaration mentioned in a statute made the thirtieth year of Charles II, entitled "an act to prevent Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament;" which oaths and declarations the Justices of Peace, at the General Sessions of the Peace to be held for the county or place where such person shall live, are hereby required to tender and administer to such persons as shall offer themselves to take, make, and subscribe the same, and thereof to keep a register. And likewise none of the persons aforesaid shall give or pay, as any fee or reward, to any officer or officers belonging to the court aforesaid, above the sum of sixpence, nor that more than once, for his or their entry of his taking the said oaths and making and subscribing the said declaration; nor above the further sum of sixpence for any certificate of the same, to be made out and signed by the officer or officers of the said court.

2d. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that all and every person and persons already convicted, or prosecuted in order to conviction of recusancy, by indictment, information, action of debt, or otherwise, grounded upon the aforesaid statutes, or any of them, that shall take the said oaths mentioned in the said statutes made this present Parliament, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, in the Court of Exchequer, or Assize, or General or Quarter Sessions, to be held for the county where such person lives, and to be thence respectively certified into the Exchequer, shall be thenceforth exempted and discharged from all the penalties, seizures, forfeitures, judgments, and executions incurred by the force of any of the aforesaid statutes, without any compensation for, or further charge whatever.

3d. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that all and every person and persons that shall as aforesaid take the said oaths, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, shall not be liable to any pains, penalties, or forfeitures mentioned in an act made in the thirty-fifth year of the late Queen Elizabeth,‖ entitled "an act to retain the Queen Majesty's subjects in obedience," nor in an act made in the twenty-second year of the late King Charles II,¶ entitled "an act to prevent and suppress seditious conventicles." Nor shall any of the said persons be prosecuted in any ecclesiastical court, for or by reason of their non-conformity to the Church of England.

* 3d James 1st, chap. 5th.
† 25th Charles 2d, chap. 2d.
‡ 30th Charles 2d, stat. 2d, chap. 1st.
§ Id.
‖ 35th Elizabeth, chap. 1st.
¶ 22d Charles 2d, chap. 1st.

4th. *Provided always, and be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that if any Assembly of persons dissenting from the Church of England shall be held in any place for religious worship, with the doors locked, barred, or bolted during any time of such meeting together, all and every such person or persons that shall come to and be at such meeting shall not receive any benefit from this law, but be liable to all the pains and penalties of all the aforesaid laws recited in this act for such their meeting, notwithstanding his taking the oaths and his making and subscribing the declaration aforesaid.

5th. *Provided always*, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to exempt any of the persons aforesaid from paying of tithes or other parochial duties, or any other duties to the church or Minister, nor from any prosecution in any ecclesiastical court, or elsewhere, for the same.

6th. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that if any person dissenting from the Church of England as aforesaid shall hereafter be chosen, or otherwise appointed, to bear the office of high constable or petit constable, church-warden, overseer of the poor, or any other parochial or ward office, and such person shall scruple to take upon him any of the said offices in regard to the oaths or any other matter or thing required by the laws to be taken or done in respect of such office, every such person shall and may execute such office or employment by a sufficient deputy, by him to be provided, that shall comply with the law on his behalf: *provided always*, the said deputy be allowed and approved by such person or persons in such manner as such officer or officers respectively should by law have been allowed or approved.

7th. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that no person dissenting from the Church of England in Holy Orders, or pretended Holy Orders, or pretending to Holy Orders, nor any Preacher or Teacher of any congregation of Dissenting Protestants that shall make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid,* and take the said oaths at the General or Quarter Sessions of the Peace to be held for the county, town, parts, or divisions where such person lives, which Court is hereby empowered to administer the same, and shall also declare his approbation of, and subscribe the articles of religion mentioned in the statute made in the thirteenth year of Queen Elizabeth,† except the 34th, 35th, and 36th, and these words of the 20th article, viz: "the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith, and yet," shall be liable to any of the pains and penalties mentioned in an act made the seventeenth year of Charles II,‡ entitled "an act for restraining nonconformists from inhabiting corporations;" nor the penalties mentioned in the aforesaid act made in the twenty-second year of his said late Majesty's reign, for or by reason of such persons preaching at any meeting for the exercise of religion; nor to the penalties of one hundred pounds mentioned in the act made in the thirteenth and fourteenth of King Charles II,§ entitled "an act for the uniformity of public prayers, and administering of sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, and for establishing the form of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Church of England," for officiating in any congregation for the exercise of religion permitted and allowed by this act.

* 17th Charles 2d, chap. 2d, 13th and 14th; also, Charles 2d, chap. 4th.
† 13th Elizabeth, chap. 12th. ‡ 17th Charles 2d, chap. 2d.
§ 11th, 13th and 14th Charles 2d, chap. 2d and 4th.

8th. *Provided always*, that the making and subscribing the said declaration, and the taking of said oaths, and making the declaration of approbation and subscription to the said articles in manner as aforesaid, by every respective person or persons herein before mentioned, at such General or Quarterly Sessions of the Peace as aforesaid, shall be then and there entered of record in the said Court, for which sixpence shall be paid to the Clerk of the Peace, and no more: *provided*, that such person shall not at any time preach in any place but with the doors not locked, barred, or bolted as aforesaid.

9th. And whereas some Dissenting Protestants scruple the baptizing of infants, *be it enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that every person in pretended Holy Orders, or pretending to Holy Orders, or Preacher or Teacher, that shall subscribe the aforesaid articles of religion, except as before excepted, and also except part of the 27th article teaching infant baptism, and shall take the oaths and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, in manner aforesaid, every such person shall enjoy all the privileges, benefits, and advantages, which any other Dissenting Minister, as aforesaid, might have or enjoy by virtue of this act.

10th. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that every Teacher or Preacher in Holy Orders, or pretended Holy Orders, that is, a Minister, Preacher, or Teacher of a congregation, that shall take the oaths herein required, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, and also subscribe such of the aforesaid articles of the Church of England as are required by this act, in manner aforesaid, shall be thenceforth exempted from serving upon any jury, or from being chosen or appointed to bear the office of church-warden, overseer of the poor, or any other parochial or ward office, or other office in any hundred, or any shire, city, town, parish, division, or wapentake.

11th. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that any Justice of the Peace may, at any time hereafter, require any person that goes to any meeting for exercise of religion to make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, and also to take the said oaths, or declaration of fidelity hereinafter mentioned; in case such persons scruple the taking of an oath, and upon the refusal thereof, such Justice of the Peace is hereby required to commit such person to prison without bail or mainprize, and to certify the name of such person to the next General or Quarter Sessions of the Peace, to be held for that county, city, town, part, or division where such person then resides; and if such person so committed shall, upon a second tender at the General or Quarter Sessions, refuse to make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid, such person refusing shall be then and there recorded, and shall be taken thenceforth, to all intents and purposes, for a Popish recusant convict, and suffer accordingly, and incur all the penalties and forfeitures of the aforesaid laws.

12th. And whereas there are certain other persons, Dissenters from the Church of England, who scruple the taking of any oath, be it enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that every such person shall make and subscribe the aforesaid declaration, and also this declaration of fidelity following:* "I, A. B., sincerely promise and solemnly declare, before God and the world, that I will be true and faithful to King William and Queen Mary. And I

* 8th George 1st, chap. 6th.

solemnly profess and declare that I do, from my heart, abhor, detest, and renounce, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed and murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever. And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any power, jurisdiction, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm." And shall subscribe a profession of their Christian belief in these words: "I, A. B., profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ, his eternal Son, the true God, and in the Holy Spirit, one God, blessed for evermore; and I do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration." Which declaration and subscription shall be entered of record, at the General Quarter Sessions of the peace for the county, city, or place where every such person shall then reside. And every such person that shall make and subscribe the two declarations and profession aforesaid, being thereunto required, shall be exempted from all the pains and penalties of all and every the aforesaid statutes made against Popish recusants, or Protestant non-conformists; and also from the penalties of an act made in the fifth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth,* entitled "an act for the assurance of the Queen's royal power over all estates and subjects within her dominions," for or by reason of such persons not taking or refusing to take the oath mentioned in the said act; and also from the penalties of an act made in the thirteenth and fourteenth years of the reign of King Charles II,† entitled "an act for preventing mischiefs that may arise by certain persons called Quakers refusing to take lawful oaths;" and enjoy all the other benefits, privileges, and advantages, under the like limitations, provisions, and conditions, which any other Dissenters should or ought to enjoy by virtue of this act.

13th. *Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that in case any persons shall refuse to take the said oaths when tendered to them, which every Justice of the Peace is hereby empowered to do, such persons shall not be permitted to make and subscribe the two declarations aforesaid, though required thereunto, either before any Justice of the Peace or at the General or Quarter Sessions, before or after any conviction of Popish recusancy as aforesaid, unless such person can, within thirty-one days after such tender of the declaration to him, produce two sufficient Protestant witnesses to testify upon oath that they believe him to be a Protestant Dissenter; or a certificate under the hands of four Protestants, who are conformable to the Church of England, or have taken the oaths and subscribed the declaration above named; and shall produce a certificate under the hands and seals of six or more sufficient men of the congregation to which he belongs, owning him for one of them.

14th. *Provided also, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that until such certificate, under the hands of six of his congregation as aforesaid, be produced, and two Protestant witnesses come to attest his being a Protestant Dissenter, or a certificate under the hands of four Protestants as aforesaid be produced, the Justice of the Peace shall, and hereby is required to take a recognizance, with two securities, in the penal sum of fifty pounds, to be levied of his goods and chattels, lands and tenements, to the

*5th Elizabeth, chap. 1st. † 13th Charles 2d; also 14th, chap. 1st.

use of the King's and Queen's Majesties, their heirs and successors, for his producing the same; and if he cannot give such security, to commit him to prison, there to remain until he has produced such certificates, or two witnesses as aforesaid.

15th. *Provided always*, and it is the true intent and meaning of this act, that all the laws made and provided for the frequenting of Divine service on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, shall be still in force and executed against all persons that offend against the said laws, except such persons come to some congregation, or assembly of religious worship, allowed or permitted by the act.

16th. *Provided always, and be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that neither this act, nor any clause, article, or thing herein contained, shall extend, or be construed to extend, to give any ease, benefit, or advantage to any Papist, or Popish recusant whatsoever, or any person that shall deny, in his preaching or writing, the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, as it is declared in the aforesaid articles of religion.

17th. *Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that if any person or persons, at any time or times after the tenth day of June, do and shall, willingly and of purpose, maliciously or contemptuously come into any cathedral, parish church, chapel, or other congregation permitted by this act, and disquiet or disturb the same, or misuse any Preacher or Teacher, such person or persons, upon proof thereof before any Justice of the Peace by two or more sufficient witnesses, shall find two securities to be bound by recognizance in the penal sum of fifty pounds, and in default of such securities shall be committed to prison, there to remain till the next General or Quarter Sessions, and upon conviction of the said offence at the said General or Quarter Sessions shall suffer the pain and penalty of twenty pounds, to the use of the King's and Queen's Majesties, their heirs and successors.*

18th. *Provided always*, that no congregation or assembly for religious worship shall be permitted or allowed by this act until the place of such meeting shall be certified to the Bishop of the diocese, or to the Arch-Deacon of that arch-deaconry, or to the Justices of the Peace at the General or Quarter Sessions of the Peace for the county, city, or place in which such meeting shall be held, and registered in the said Bishop's or Arch-Deacon's court respectively, or recorded at the said General or Quarter Sessions; the Register or Clerk of the peace whereof respectively is hereby required to register the same, and to give certificate thereof to such person as shall demand the same, for which there shall be no greater fee or reward than the sum of sixpence.

Such is the Act of Toleration granted by William and Mary during the first year of their reign, which was a great relief to Dissenters of every kind. It was judged advisable to publish it thus at large, as there appear to be many who either never knew what its provisions were, or, if they ever did know, seem to have forgotten them. It does not at all abolish the establishment of the Episcopal Church of England, but it ties the hands, and restrains the powers of the high church persecuting party, and affords

* See George 1. stat. 2. chap. 5. sec. 4.

some partial relief to the oppressed Dissenters. The relief is said to be only partial, for Dissenters were still taxed to pay the salaries of the clergy of the establishment, and all other incidental expenses attendant upon an extravagant and expensive form of worship, while they were still left under many galling disabilities, and subjected to many delays and expenses in qualifying themselves for the benefits of the Act of Toleration, and getting their houses or places of worship licensed according to law; and, after all this, had to support their own Ministers and mode of worship in addition to all the rest. Yet this was a great relief to what they had been subjected before.

The tories and high church Episcopal clergy were never fond of King William, on account of his Presbyterian predilections and education, acquired in Holland. Much less did they relish his Act of Toleration. But King William had a generous mind, and imagined they might be gained by gentleness and kindness, and therefore selected a motley kind of ministry, which distressed him to the last. Thus they enjoyed the advantages of this glorious revolution, whilst they acted the most ungrateful part toward their deliverer, and most unkindly and ungenerously toward their dissenting brethren.

Nor did this tory and high church party cease to discover their enmity to the Dissenters afterward, as often as power was in their hands. It was impossible to injure them seriously while King William lived; but no sooner was Queen Anne advanced to the throne than they endeavored to cramp the Toleration by the bill against *occasional conformity*, which was brought into the House one session after another, till at length it obtained the Royal assent in the year 1711, under the specious and deceitful title of "an act to preserve the Protestant religion, and to confirm the Toleration, and further to secure the Protestant succession."* After making some few concessions in favor and support of the Toleration, it then enacts "that if any persons in office who by the laws are obliged to qualify themselves by receiving the sacrament or test, shall ever resort to a conventicle or meeting of Dissenters for religious worship during the time of their continuance in such office, they shall forfeit twenty pounds for every such offence, and be disqualified for any such office for the future till they have made oath that they have entirely conformed to the church, and not been at any conventicle for the space of a whole year." So that no person in the least office in the *customs, excise, or common council*, &c. could ever enter the doors of a meeting-house where Dissenters were worshipping.

* See 10th Queen Anne, chap. 2d.

And also, in the last year of Queen Anne, the Toleration was further straitened by an act to prevent the growth of *schism*, for with these gentlemen *all Dissenters were schismatics;* and in order to prevent the growth of schism, the education of their children was taken out of the hands of their friends, and intrusted only with such as were *full and entire conformists.* "And if any schoolmaster or tutor be willingly present at any conventicle of Dissenters for religious worship, he shall suffer three months imprisonment, and be disqualified as above for teaching school for the future."* This act was made to take place August 1, 1714, the very day the Queen died. But King George I, who succeeded to the throne, being fully satisfied that these hardships were brought upon the Dissenters for their attachment and steady adherence to the *Protestant succession* in his illustrious family against the tory and jacobite ministry, who were paving the way for a Popish pretender, had these insidious and oppressive laws repealed in the fifth year of his reign.† As this act is not so unreasonably long, it shall now be given entire, as a sample of the spirit of the times:

The repeal, entitled an act for the strengthening the Protestant interests in these Kingdoms.

Whereas an act of Parliament was made in the tenth year of the late Queen Anne, entitled an act for preserving the Protestant religion, by better securing the Church of England as by law established, and for confirming the Toleration granted to Protestant Dissenters,‡ and for supplying the defects thereof, and for the further securing the Protestant succession by requiring the practisers of law in North Britain to take the oaths and subscribe the declarations therein mentioned; and whereas part of the said act, and also another act hereinafter mentioned, have been found to be inconvenient, be it therefore enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice of the Lords, spiritual and temporal, and Commons in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that the said recited act, passed in the tenth year of the reign of the late Queen Anne, from the beginning thereof, and also one other act made in the twelfth year of the late Queen Anne, entitled "an act to prevent the growth of schism, and for the further security of the Churches of England and Ireland as by law established," shall be and are hereby repealed, annulled, and made void.

Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any Mayor, Bailiff, or other Magistrate in that part of Great Britain called

* See 12th Queen Anne.

† See 5th George 1st, chap. 4.

‡ See the Act of Toleration as above.

England, the dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick upon Tweed, or the Isles of Guernsey or Jersey, shall knowingly or willingly resort to or be present at any meeting for religious worship, other than the Church of England as by law established, *in the gown or other peculiar habits, or attended with the ensign or ensigns of or belonging to such his office,* that every such Mayor, Bailiff, or other Magistrate, being thereof convicted by due course of law, shall be disabled to hold such office or offices, employment or employments, and shall be adjudged incapable to bear any public employment whatsoever, within that part of Great Britain called England, the dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick upon Tweed, or Isles of Guernsey or Jersey.

solemnly profess and declare that I do, from my heart, abhor, detest, and renounce, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed and murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever. And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any power, jurisdiction, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm." And shall subscribe a profession of their Christian belief in these words: "I, A. B., profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ, his eternal Son, the true God, and in the Holy Spirit, one God, blessed for evermore; and I do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration." Which declaration and subscription shall be entered of record, at the General Quarter Sessions of the peace for the county, city, or place where every such person shall then reside. And every such person that shall make and subscribe the two declarations and profession aforesaid, being thereunto required, shall be exempted from all the pains and penalties of all and every the aforesaid statutes made against Popish recusants, or Protestant non-conformists; and also from the penalties of an act made in the fifth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth,* entitled "an act for the assurance of the Queen's royal power over all estates and subjects within her dominions," for or by reason of such persons not taking or refusing to take the oath mentioned in the said act; and also from the penalties of an act made in the thirteenth and fourteenth years of the reign of King Charles II,† entitled "an act for preventing mischiefs that may arise by certain persons called Quakers refusing to take lawful oaths;" and enjoy all the other benefits, privileges, and advantages, under the like limitations, provisions, and conditions, which any other Dissenters should or ought to enjoy by virtue of this act.

13th. *Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid,* that in case any persons shall refuse to take the said oaths when tendered to them, which every Justice of the Peace is hereby empowered to do, such persons shall not be permitted to make and subscribe the two declarations aforesaid, though required thereunto, either before any Justice of the Peace or at the General or Quarter Sessions, before or after any conviction of Popish recusancy as aforesaid, unless such person can, within thirty-one days after such tender of the declaration to him, produce two sufficient Protestant witnesses to testify upon oath that they believe him to be a Protestant Dissenter; or a certificate under the hands of four Protestants, who are conformable to the Church of England, or have taken the oaths and subscribed the declaration above named; and shall produce a certificate under the hands and seals of six or more sufficient men of the congregation to which he belongs, owning him for one of them.

14th. *Provided also, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid,* that until such certificate, under the hands of six of his congregation as aforesaid, be produced, and two Protestant witnesses come to attest his being a Protestant Dissenter, or a certificate under the hands of four Protestants as aforesaid be produced, the Justice of the Peace shall, and hereby is required to take a recognizance, with two securities, in the penal sum of fifty pounds, to be levied of his goods and chattels, lands and tenements, to the

*5th Elizabeth, chap. 1st. † 13th Charles 2d; also 14th, chap. 1st.

use of the King's and Queen's Majesties, their heirs and successors, for his producing the same; and if he cannot give such security, to commit him to prison, there to remain until he has produced such certificates, or two witnesses as aforesaid.

15th. *Provided always*, and it is the true intent and meaning of this act, that all the laws made and provided for the frequenting of Divine service on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, shall be still in force and executed against all persons that offend against the said laws, except such persons come to some congregation, or assembly of religious worship, allowed or permitted by the act.

16th. *Provided always, and be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that neither this act, nor any clause, article, or thing herein contained, shall extend, or be construed to extend, to give any ease, benefit, or advantage to any Papist, or Popish recusant whatsoever, or any person that shall deny, in his preaching or writing, the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, as it is declared in the aforesaid articles of religion.

17th. *Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid*, that if any person or persons, at any time or times after the tenth day of June, do and shall, willingly and of purpose, maliciously or contemptuously come into any cathedral, parish church, chapel, or other congregation permitted by this act, and disquiet or disturb the same, or misuse any Preacher or Teacher, such person or persons, upon proof thereof before any Justice of the Peace by two or more sufficient witnesses, shall find two securities to be bound by recognizance in the penal sum of fifty pounds, and in default of such securities shall be committed to prison, there to remain till the next General or Quarter Sessions, and upon conviction of the said offence at the said General or Quarter Sessions shall suffer the pain and penalty of twenty pounds, to the use of the King's and Queen's Majesties, their heirs and successors.*

18th. *Provided always*, that no congregation or assembly for religious worship shall be permitted or allowed by this act until the place of such meeting shall be certified to the Bishop of the diocese, or to the Arch-Deacon of that arch-deaconry, or to the Justices of the Peace at the General or Quarter Sessions of the Peace for the county, city, or place in which such meeting shall be held, and registered in the said Bishop's or Arch-Deacon's court respectively, or recorded at the said General or Quarter Sessions; the Register or Clerk of the peace whereof respectively is hereby required to register the same, and to give certificate thereof to such person as shall demand the same, for which there shall be no greater fee or reward than the sum of sixpence.

Such is the Act of Toleration granted by William and Mary during the first year of their reign, which was a great relief to Dissenters of every kind. It was judged advisable to publish it thus at large, as there appear to be many who either never knew what its provisions were, or, if they ever did know, seem to have forgotten them. It does not at all abolish the establishment of the Episcopal Church of England, but it ties the hands, and restrains the powers of the high church persecuting party, and affords

* See George 1. stat. 2. chap. 5. sec. 4.

some partial relief to the oppressed Dissenters. The relief is said to be only partial, for Dissenters were still taxed to pay the salaries of the clergy of the establishment, and all other incidental expenses attendant upon an extravagant and expensive form of worship, while they were still left under many galling disabilities, and subjected to many delays and expenses in qualifying themselves for the benefits of the Act of Toleration, and getting their houses or places of worship licensed according to law; and, after all this, had to support their own Ministers and mode of worship in addition to all the rest. Yet this was a great relief to what they had been subjected before.

The tories and high church Episcopal clergy were never fond of King William, on account of his Presbyterian predilections and education, acquired in Holland. Much less did they relish his Act of Toleration. But King William had a generous mind, and imagined they might be gained by gentleness and kindness, and therefore selected a motley kind of ministry, which distressed him to the last. Thus they enjoyed the advantages of this glorious revolution, whilst they acted the most ungrateful part toward their deliverer, and most unkindly and ungenerously toward their dissenting brethren.

Nor did this tory and high church party cease to discover their enmity to the Dissenters afterward, as often as power was in their hands. It was impossible to injure them seriously while King William lived; but no sooner was Queen Anne advanced to the throne than they endeavored to cramp the Toleration by the bill against *occasional conformity*, which was brought into the House one session after another, till at length it obtained the Royal assent in the year 1711, under the specious and deceitful title of "an act to preserve the Protestant religion, and to confirm the Toleration, and further to secure the Protestant succession."* After making some few concessions in favor and support of the Toleration, it then enacts "that if any persons in office who by the laws are obliged to qualify themselves by receiving the sacrament or test, shall ever resort to a conventicle or meeting of Dissenters for religious worship during the time of their continuance in such office, they shall forfeit twenty pounds for every such offence, and be disqualified for any such office for the future till they have made oath that they have entirely conformed to the church, and not been at any conventicle for the space of a whole year." So that no person in the least office in the *customs, excise, or common council*, &c. could ever enter the doors of a meeting-house where Dissenters were worshipping.

* See 10th Queen Anne, chap. 2d.

And also, in the last year of Queen Anne, the Toleration was further straitened by an act to prevent the growth of *schism*, for with these gentlemen *all Dissenters were schismatics;* and in order to prevent the growth of schism, the education of their children was taken out of the hands of their friends, and intrusted only with such as were *full and entire conformists.* "And if any schoolmaster or tutor be willingly present at any conventicle of Dissenters for religious worship, he shall suffer three months imprisonment, and be disqualified as above for teaching school for the future."* This act was made to take place August 1, 1714, the very day the Queen died. But King George I, who succeeded to the throne, being fully satisfied that these hardships were brought upon the Dissenters for their attachment and steady adherence to the *Protestant succession* in his illustrious family against the tory and jacobite ministry, who were paving the way for a Popish pretender, had these insidious and oppressive laws repealed in the fifth year of his reign.† As this act is not so unreasonably long, it shall now be given entire, as a sample of the spirit of the times:

The repeal, entitled an act for the strengthening the Protestant interests in these Kingdoms.

Whereas an act of Parliament was made in the tenth year of the late Queen Anne, entitled an act for preserving the Protestant religion, by better securing the Church of England as by law established, and for confirming the Toleration granted to Protestant Dissenters,‡ and for supplying the defects thereof, and for the further securing the Protestant succession by requiring the practisers of law in North Britain to take the oaths and subscribe the declarations therein mentioned; and whereas part of the said act, and also another act hereinafter mentioned, have been found to be inconvenient, be it therefore enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice of the Lords, spiritual and temporal, and Commons in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that the said recited act, passed in the tenth year of the reign of the late Queen Anne, from the beginning thereof, and also one other act made in the twelfth year of the late Queen Anne, entitled "an act to prevent the growth of schism, and for the further security of the Churches of England and Ireland as by law established," shall be and are hereby repealed, annulled, and made void.

Provided always, and be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any Mayor, Bailiff, or other Magistrate in that part of Great Britain called

* See 12th Queen Anne.

† See 5th George 1st, chap. 4.

‡ See the Act of Toleration as above.

England, the dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick upon Tweed, or the Isles of Guernsey or Jersey, shall knowingly or willingly resort to or be present at any meeting for religious worship, other than the Church of England as by law established, *in the gown or other peculiar habits, or attended with the ensign or ensigns of or belonging to such his office,* that every such Mayor, Bailiff, or other Magistrate, being thereof convicted by due course of law, shall be disabled to hold such office or offices, employment or employments, and shall be adjudged incapable to bear any public employment whatsoever, within that part of Great Britain called England, the dominion of Wales, and town of Berwick upon Tweed, or Isles of Guernsey or Jersey.

JW